



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2021

No. 193

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Creator God, open our eyes to the gift that You have laid before us this day. Fill us early with an awareness of Your unfailing love, that throughout the day we would know the satisfaction of happiness found only in You and the content of joy that we have in Your love for us.

At every moment of the day, bring us evidence of Your loving kindness. At every turn, cause us to know what way You would have us walk. At every encounter, give us the word You would have us speak.

For we put our trust in You. When all else around us proves fleeting, be our constant.

When disappointments erode our sense of certainty, may our faith in You be sure.

When we weary from our labor, may we find strength in the foundation You have laid for our days.

When we are inclined to doubt, may our reverence of You fill us with the joy of our salvation.

In Your mercy may we receive today a wealth of wisdom and knowledge.

Hear now our gratitude for the daily favor You have shown us as we offer our prayers in Your most holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAPPAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GOOD BILLS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, the House continues to pursue the bipartisan infrastructure bill and the Build Back Better bill. There will be a Rules Committee meeting today on those bills. Hopefully, they will come to the floor and will pass with bipartisan support, as the infrastructure bill was passed with bipartisan support in the Senate.

The House has been working to get the framework improved to include other issues. There are so many good issues that we can have in this bill, and we hope to have the maximum possible.

But as a baker once said, and my father implored me as a child: Look at the doughnut, and not at the hole.

We will pass a very good bill, hopefully bipartisan.

TIME TO SECURE OUR BORDER

(Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, as Congress debates spending trillions of taxpayer dollars, there is a

crisis on our southern border that is being ignored.

In the past year, our Border Patrol agents have made almost 1.5 million apprehensions, yet we are still seeing that there is a massive surge in illegal immigration.

The rise in overdose deaths that our country has seen can be directly tied to the increase in fentanyl that is being smuggled into the United States through Mexico. Now, at the height of the crisis, we are seeing reports that the Biden administration wants to pay settlements to immigrants who enter our country illegally. This is unacceptable.

Now is the time to secure our border and stop the security and humanitarian crises that this policy has created.

Right now, Congress should be working to address the real and present danger at our southern border, not debating yet another socialist spending spree.

THE TIME IS RIGHT FOR VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus and the millions of Black voters, I rise today in support of H.R. 4, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Today, we step into history as we tread the same path taken 56 years ago when President Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law, calling that day "a triumph for freedom as huge as any victory that has ever been won on any battlefield."

We have not come this far to turn the clock back, nor shall we let the sacrifices of Fannie Lou Hamer, Martin Luther King, and countless others who marched, fought, disrupted, and lost their lives for the right to vote, be in vain.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6129

Therefore, I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

As our friend and brother, the late John Lewis, said so well: "The time is right. The time is now."

Our Power, Our Message.

BUILD BACK BROKE

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, President Biden looks to call his phony tax-and-spend plan Build Back Better when it actually should be called build back broke. It broke last night, and it is breaking this week.

This plan is a disaster for Americans and the future of our small businesses. The National Federation of Independent Business recently reported that over two-thirds of small businesses faced significant impacts from the supply chain disruptions. Fifty-one percent of owners reported they are still unable to fill job openings. And uncertainty about the future among small business owners increased by 5 points, according to the NFIB Uncertainty Index.

American small businesses are facing unprecedented challenges, and unfortunately, Washington bureaucrats are turning their backs on their concerns and pushing ahead to increase taxes, fuel rising inflation, and expand government control.

I came to Washington to fight for Main Street America. That is what I am. And every American should know these closed-door negotiations and socialist policies are fiscal insanity and will crush our economy.

Cut taxes and save our economy, a new concept.

In God We Trust.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT JESSE SHERRILL

(Mr. PAPPAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life and service of New Hampshire State Police Staff Sergeant Jesse Sherrill. Staff Sergeant Sherrill was tragically killed on October 28 when his cruiser was struck by a tractor-trailer when he was on duty working an overnight detail.

This is an immeasurable loss for his family and community and the entire State of New Hampshire.

Today, our State will pause for a celebration of life for Staff Sergeant Sherrill. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife and their children and extended family. We must never forget his dedicated service to keeping our State safe and the burden borne by the Sherrill family.

My thoughts are also with the men and women of the New Hampshire State Police and law enforcement community that has lost one of its own.

Day in and day out, those who serve and protect our communities risk their own safety for all of us. We can never forget their sacrifice.

I urge Granite Staters to take time to reflect on the legacy of Staff Sergeant Sherrill and to keep his family in your thoughts and prayers.

Through this horrible tragedy, we must honor his example and keep his memory alive.

RECOGNIZING WILLIE JETT

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of St. Cloud area school district superintendent Willie Jett. Willie will be retiring from his role as superintendent at the end of this school year, ending 8 years in service to the district.

During his tenure, Willie has been an advocate for students, a leader for faculty, and an ally to parents. When the district experienced challenges, Willie focused on a student-centric approach to education. Willie's leadership prioritized the performance of each student and provided the support they needed to thrive.

Willie led the St. Cloud school district through times of crisis and change. He helped schools rebuild after fires and successfully navigated the COVID-19 crisis. Willie oversaw the construction of the new St. Cloud Tech High School and an early childhood education center. Willie even participated in one of our Congressional telephone townhalls to answer questions about remote learning for families across the St. Cloud community.

Willie remains a friend and leader in our community. Willie's presence in the St. Cloud school district will be missed.

Madam Speaker, I thank Willie for all of his work, and I wish him good luck in the next chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVERS MONTH

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of November as National Family Caregivers Month.

Nearly 600,000 New Yorkers are caregivers for loved ones living with dementia. This is difficult work, and it takes an emotional toll that too often goes unrecognized.

My bill, the Comprehensive Care for Alzheimer's Act, would enact higher-quality dementia care standards in Medicare and Medicaid. It broadens assistance, including direct education and support for caregivers and improved access to high-quality doctors with expertise in dementia.

Dementia care is very complex, so we need to do all we can to make sure the

patients and their families have what they need.

I hear regularly from my Alzheimer's advocates in Buffalo and western New York and throughout New York that much more needs to be done.

This bill can help them get the best possible care for their loved ones while providing support to them as caregivers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HIGH COST OF A BIDEN THANKSGIVING

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as Biden continues to push the insulting \$3.5 trillion Big Government socialist scheme, real Americans will see their Thanksgiving 2021 "shaping up to be the most expensive meal in the history of the holiday," as reported by MSNBC.

The price of turkey already costs 25 cents more per pound. It is not the only part of the holiday to take a bite out of your family account, with Biden inflation destroying jobs.

"Nearly every component of the traditional American Thanksgiving dinner, from the disposable aluminum turkey roasting pan to the coffee and pie, will cost more this year," as sadly admitted by The New York Times.

Democrat elite think they are smarter than anyone, and they believe Democrat voters are ignorant to believe that \$3.5 trillion in spending costs zero dollars.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from Afghanistan to America.

Congratulations to the people of Virginia and New Jersey and Springdale Mayor-elect Justin Ricard.

MAKING GOOD DECISIONS WITH GOOD INFORMATION

(Ms. BOURDEAUX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution, H. Con. Res. 44, which the House will consider later today.

When I came to Congress, I promised my constituents that we would make responsible decisions about our Nation's fiscal future. It is extremely difficult, however, to make good decisions without good information.

The Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution will require the Comptroller General to provide an annual assessment of our Nation's finances to Congress, a small but important first step in getting our fiscal house in order.

Similarly, my bipartisan bill, the Duplication Scoring Act, would ensure

Members are aware when new bills potentially duplicate existing programs in areas which have already been identified by the GAO.

I urge all Members to support passage of the Fiscal State of the Nation act today and renew our commitment to putting our Nation on a sustainable fiscal trajectory.

VACCINE MANDATE UNDERMINES ESSENTIAL SERVICES

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, when the coronavirus shut down this country, first responders and healthcare professionals kept our communities going and safe. The essential services they provide can't be done from behind a computer screen, Madam Speaker.

Joe Biden's vaccine mandate undermines the preparedness of these services. The Americans we celebrated for the last 20 months are now forced to get the coronavirus vaccine or be fired from their jobs. It is disgusting that the Biden administration is threatening these public servants' livelihoods over these issues.

Our country cannot afford labor shortages in essential services. Look at law enforcement, for example. The defund the police movement continues to embolden criminals and lower morale among the law enforcement community.

On top of these problems, thousands of police officers are facing termination thanks to Biden's vaccine mandate.

This is a recipe for disaster amidst rising crime. I guarantee that if you are in danger of or a victim of crime, the last thing on your mind will be the vaccination status of the responding officer.

Congress needs to stand up for these essential workers under attack from Joe Biden's vaccine mandate. This week, I will introduce legislation allowing these workers to decide for themselves on taking the coronavirus vaccine, free from threats of termination if they decide against getting the shot, Madam Speaker. No American citizen should be fired for making a healthcare decision they believe is in their best interest.

□ 1215

HEALTH EQUITY PROVISIONS OF BUILD BACK BETTER

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the Build Back Better Act.

The Build Back Better Act will bring transformational change to the Amer-

ican people, create a more equitable healthcare system, and save lives.

One of the greatest ongoing injustices in our country is just how many people do not have access to affordable healthcare. That population is overwhelmingly made up of people of color and rural Americans.

Policymakers and medical institutions have not prioritized the healthcare needs of communities of color and rural communities. The Build Back Better Act will help these communities by closing the healthcare coverage gap, create more affordable coverage options, expand benefits for seniors, invest in improving access to mental health and substance use disorders, attack the gun violence epidemic with public-health focused interventions, invest in addressing the Black maternal mortality crisis, and lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

Investing in affordable care, preventive care, and targeted reductions in violence will result in fewer extreme health scenarios, fewer emergency room visits, and over time, will save us money and reduce the burden on our healthcare system.

Healthcare is a human right. Passing the Build Back Better Act is a step in the right direction.

RECOGNIZING FFA NATIONAL PRESIDENT COLE BAERLOCHER

(Mrs. RODGERS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Eastern Washington's finest young men, Cole Baerlocher.

Cole is a student at Washington State University, and he recently was elected to serve as the next national president of the Future Farmers of America.

For Cole, his family, and our entire community, this is a huge deal. Cole is from Colfax, the county seat of Whitman County, the top wheat-producing county in America.

Having him serve as the face of this organization is a tremendous honor. The FFA has more than 735,000 members; 37 candidates were considered for the honor of serving as president. Only one was selected to lead, and that person was Cole.

Cole, I know I speak for our entire community when I say congratulations on this incredible achievement. We could not be more proud. Go Cougs!

BUILD BACK BETTER CHILDCARE

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the inclusion of universal childcare and early education as part of the President's Build Back Better legislative agenda.

In Massachusetts, a family with two young children spends on average 28

percent of their income on childcare for 1 year. The Build Back Better Act will provide universal, high-quality, free preschool for every three- and four-year-old in America. It will ensure that a four-person Massachusetts family making up to \$170,000 pays no more than 7 percent of their income on high-quality childcare.

Investing in the health and education of our children is the best long-term investment our country can make. With our future in mind, we must provide access to as many families as possible, as soon as possible. This will require raising provider wages to a living wage immediately and ensuring that more families can benefit in year one when we pass the Build Back Better Act.

ADDRESSING AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, this time last year, America was energy independent. Now our Nation is facing a full-blown energy crisis, leaving the American people to ask, "What changed?"

Well, the answer is simple.

Unlike the Trump administration, the Biden administration is determined to make it more difficult for American energy producers to develop affordable and reliable energy here at home.

On his first day in office, Joe Biden canceled the Keystone pipeline. Soon after, he banned all new oil and gas leases on Federal lands. As a result, Americans are paying exponentially more at the pump with gas prices reaching a 7-year high. And this winter, the cost to heat our homes is expected to jump 54 percent.

As the top Republican on the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, I have been disappointed to see Joe Biden and Democrats in Congress double down on their failed agenda by pushing a \$5.5 trillion tax-and-spend package that will only increase our energy prices.

Instead of canceling commonsense energy projects, let's empower American energy workers to do what they do best. Instead of targeting American energy companies, let's make it easier for them to increase domestic oil and gas production.

If we do this, the next century can be an American century.

BUILD BACK BETTER AGENDA

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Build Back Better agenda.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to make transformational change for women, transformational change for families, and communities

of color. From affordable childcare and eldercare to raising the pay of care workers and providing universal pre-K to expanding the child tax credit, this agenda will lift women out of poverty, educate our children, and lower costs.

We can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, because there is so much good in this bill. This agenda is about who we are as a country and the values we represent. The Build Back Better agenda will build back better for women and families.

CONGRATULATING SOLON HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS CROSS COUNTRY TEAM

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a group of young women who have made history in a small town in my district.

Last week, the Solon High School Girls Cross Country team defied the odds at the 3A Iowa State championship and brought home their first girls cross country title after upsetting last year's champion, Ballard High School.

Led by top ten finishers, Kayla Young and Emma Bock, every Solon Spartan finished in the top 54 in a crowded 133-member field, earning a total score of 77 points.

Congratulations to Kayla Young, Emma Bock, Anna Quillin, Meghan O'Neill, Mara Duster, Gracie Federspiel, and Kaia Holtkamp. This is a great achievement for both Solon and the Second District, and I could not be prouder to represent all of these young women in Congress.

HONORING THE LIFE AND IMPACT OF JOHN H. JOHNSON

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 605, to honor the life and impact of John H. Johnson.

Though he was born in Arkansas, and known for his work in Chicago, Johnson's impact isn't limited by geography. In fact, in the village of Harlem, his work is beloved. He was a trailblazer of African-American media, starting his first magazine at 24, going on to have an internationally acclaimed career in publishing, with magazines like *Ebony* and *Jet* being globally renowned and internationally recognizable to this very day.

Madam Speaker, Johnson said that you have to change images before you can change acts and institutions—and changing acts and institutions, he did.

The impact Johnson had on his community and the world of media cannot be understated, and still serves as a role model of perseverance and success to this very day, inspiring the next generation of Black and Brown leaders.

November 1 is celebrated in Arkansas as John H. Johnson Day. With great pride, I rise today to support this resolution, but he is also revered and loved in the village of Harlem.

CONGRATULATING ATLANTA BRAVES AS 2021 WORLD SERIES CHAMPIONS

(Mr. CLYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2021 World Series champions, the Atlanta Braves.

After a stunning six-game World Series against the Houston Astros, culminating in a shutout victory last night, the Braves brought home the Commissioner's Trophy for the first time since 1995.

I, along with millions of Georgians, am incredibly proud of this Braves team for their unparalleled talent, electric team spirit, and unwavering determination.

Candidly, last night's victory was poetic justice after the Major League Baseball commissioner caved to the woke left and stole the All-Star game from Georgia earlier this year over Georgia's new election law reform that made it easier to vote and harder to cheat.

While ill-advised political ploys fade away, World Series championships are forever.

Chop on, Atlanta Braves.

PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the historic deal reached by the House Committee on Ways and Means to include paid family and medical leave in the Build Back Better Act.

For decades, the United States has fallen behind the rest of the world in the support that we provide for working families. Without a national paid leave policy, families have been forced to make an impossible choice between caring for their loved ones and putting food on the table.

Across the Nation, there are millions of Americans like my constituent, Tameka Henry, who has lost \$200,000 in wages over the course of her lifetime while caring for her chronically ill husband. Those lost wages mean lost contributions to Medicare and Social Security that push working Americans further behind in our economy. This shouldn't be a partisan issue.

Paid leave levels the playing field for our small businesses and lifts up our entire economy. I hope that my Republican colleagues will come forward to help us deliver this historic change for the American people. But if they fail,

make no mistake, Democrats will deliver for their constituents and for our own.

DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

(Mrs. MILLER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the Texas heartbeat case.

I pray that the Justices find wisdom and compassion to defend the rights of the unborn.

So many of my constituents were horrified to learn that the FDA was actually purchasing fetal tissue to surgically implant baby skulls into mice. Thank God President Trump defended life and stopped this horrific practice.

We opened this session with a prayer to "Creator God." God is the creator of human life, which begins at conception. Abortion is an offense to God, and we are bringing the wrath of God down upon our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge us as lawmakers and Americans to repent and change course. Every child is made in the image of God, and every child is precious.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CARR CENTER

(Ms. TLAIB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Carr Center in Detroit, Michigan, as they celebrate 30 years of preserving, presenting, promoting, and developing African and African-American cultural arts traditions in southeastern Michigan.

Founded in 1991 as the Arts League of Michigan, the Carr Center has worked to fulfill its mission of bringing artistic excellence by offering a wide array of programming.

Building upon its initial creative placemaking, the Carr Center has become a destination and hub for the performing arts in the city of Detroit.

The Carr Center has implemented three pillars of programming: Carr Center Presents, Carr Center Contemporary focus on performing and visual arts, while the Carr Center Arts Academy offers in-school and intensive summer arts education opportunities.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognizing the Carr Center's many contributions to southeastern Michigan over the past three decades as we wish them well in the years to come. They are a true gem of Michigan's 13th District.

SKYROCKETING INFLATION

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, this Thanksgiving is expected to be the most expensive in history due to skyrocketing inflation. Americans are also being warned that their Christmas presents will cost more and might not arrive on time due to the supply chain disruptions. I hope that doesn't happen.

President Biden's and House Democrats' out-of-control spending policies are to blame for both the economic and supply chain woes. To make matters worse, they are now pushing a made-in-America tax, which will only drive businesses and jobs overseas and further devastate our troubled economy.

There are plenty of signs that our economy is significantly struggling, unfortunately. Most recently, the GDP growth decelerated to 2 percent in the third quarter. This is the slowest growth rate since the start of the pandemic-era recovery. Real disposable personal income also decreased another 5.6 percent in the third quarter after decreasing a staggering 30.2 percent in the second quarter.

We must reverse course and abandon these irresponsible policies rather than continuing to compound the economic pain.

BUILD BACK BETTER AGENDA

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of President Biden's Build Back Better agenda.

Last November, the American people sent us to Washington to create more jobs, cut taxes, and lower costs for middle class families, and we are ready to deliver.

The Build Back Better agenda will lower healthcare costs for families across my district and across the country, cut taxes for more than 35 million working families, and expand high-quality home healthcare for millions of older Americans and Americans with disabilities.

As the President also returns from the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Glasgow, we have an opportunity to pass a \$550 billion investment in fighting climate change and transitioning to a green economy.

We simply do not have time to spare. The American people are counting on us. Let's get this done.

GIVING AMNESTY TO MILLIONS OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to address the Build Back Better bill. Earlier this week the Border Patrol announced that they had

found 557 bodies of people who were trying to get into this country last year. That is more than double what it was a year ago.

I am shocked that after finding all these bodies, either dehydrating in the heat, drowning in the Rio Grande, or falling off the 30-foot high fence, that they still are doing all they can to cause illegal immigration in this country.

In particular, in this bill, you are still trying to give amnesty to millions of people, which acts as a magnet for people to come here. You are still trying to give free college tuition to people who come in this country illegally, while the middle class in this country—who you apparently don't care for—goes tens of thousands of dollars in debt to get that degree.

This is happening all at the time that President Biden is apparently negotiating giving families, who try to come here illegally, \$450,000.

Please, majority party, give up on this horrible Build Back Better bill, which is just one more effort to transform and change America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

CONGRATULATING THE ATLANTA BRAVES ON WINNING THE 2021 WORLD SERIES

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud the 2021 World Series Champions, the Atlanta Braves. I am enormously proud of the Atlanta Braves, their players, their coaches, and especially their fans for their determination and resiliency on a long road to this championship title.

The last time the Braves won the World Series was 1995. I can finally say that my Atlanta Braves are champions once again. With the World Series victory, the Braves completed one of history's greatest championship turn-arounds.

Plagued by injuries to their best pitcher and outfielder, the Braves had a losing record in August. Through much adversity, the Braves relied on a number of players and others who helped them to regain the World Series title.

As Braves fans in Georgia and around the world celebrate, I congratulate this team on a remarkable season, a 2021 World Series title, and a place in the history books.

The city and people of Atlanta, the great State of Georgia, and the great Braves nation will be forever grateful to the 2021 Atlanta Braves for breaking the curse and winning it all.

The Atlanta Braves are the World Series champions.

Go Braves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to maintain proper decorum while in the Chamber.

EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ARE CRYSTAL CLEAR

(Mr. KAHELE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAHELE. Madam Speaker, we face a now-or-never moment to reverse the severe consequences of the climate crisis. Our narrow margin to avert catastrophe is shrinking, and right now, Democrats hold the power to enact aggressive policies to turn that tide. Failing to meet the moment in the Build Back Better Act is frankly a non-starter.

In my home State of Hawaii, the devastating effects of climate change are crystal clear. Each year, we experience unprecedented flooding, which causes landslides, washes out bridges, and creates dam failures; rising sea levels that lead to coastal erosion are visible along every island; and warming waters that cause widespread coral bleaching that kill our fish populations and threaten our economy.

As we face these challenges, Hawaii has been a leader in green energy sources, including geothermal, ocean, solar, and hydro-energy. However, while my State can do its part, we need a robust national effort if we are to sustain our planet for future generations.

Madam Speaker, the global climate crisis is our greatest national security threat, and I urge all my colleagues to answer the call to action by passing the Build Back Better Act.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL GRAIN AND FEED ASSOCIATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Grain and Feed Association as they celebrate 125 years of supporting every facet of the agricultural value chain.

Established as one of the first industry-based arbitration systems in North America, NGFA has transformed American farmers' bounties into safe, nutrition, sustainable, and affordable human and animal food.

The National Grain and Feed Association is a nonprofit trade association that serves more than 1,000 companies and 7,500 facilities. They continue to advocate for grain, feed, and processing interests of the complete value chain and promote the competitiveness of the United States of America.

In order to recognize this great achievement, House Agriculture Committee Chairman DAVID SCOTT and I introduced a resolution celebrating the 125th anniversary celebrating the efforts of the NGFA in transforming the American farmer's bounty.

Madam Speaker, the National Grain and Feed Association has longstanding history and notoriety for their continual efforts toward supporting American producers and ensuring their competitiveness in agriculture.

Madam Speaker, I want to say congratulations on 125 years.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 3, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 3, 2021, at 9:57 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1510.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2093.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

FISCAL STATE OF THE NATION RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) providing for a joint hearing of the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the executive branch, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 44

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution".

SEC. 2. ANNUAL JOINT HEARING OF BUDGET COMMITTEES TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays) after the date on which the Secretary

of the Treasury submits to Congress the audited financial statement required under paragraph (1) of section 331(e) of title 31, United States Code, on a date agreed upon by the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate (hereafter referred to as the "Budget Committees") and the Comptroller General of the United States, the Budget Committees shall hold a joint hearing (hereafter referred to as the "Joint Hearing") to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General reviewing the findings of the audit required under paragraph (2) of such section and providing, with respect to the information included by the Secretary in the report accompanying such audited financial statement, an analysis of the financial position and condition of the Federal Government, including financial measures (such as the net operating cost, income, budget deficits, or budget surpluses) and sustainability measures (such as the long-term fiscal projection or social insurance projection) described in such report.

(b) PRESENTATION OF STATEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAO STRATEGIES AND MEANS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall ensure that the presentation at the Joint Hearing is made in accordance with the Strategies and Means of the Government Accountability Office, so that the presentation will provide professional, objective, fact-based, nonpartisan, nonideological, fair, and balanced information to the members attending the Joint Hearing.

(c) RULES APPLICABLE TO JOINT HEARING.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the Joint Hearing shall be subject to rules agreed to by the chairs of the Budget Committees.

(2) OPEN HEARING.—The Joint Hearing shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage.

(3) ATTENDANCE.—The Joint Hearing shall accommodate non-participatory attendance by any Senator and any Member of the House of Representatives, including any Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement under subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any audited financial statement submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don't have to tell you that these are partisan times. We don't often get to consider something that is supported by both Democrats on the Rules Committee and Republicans on the Rules Committee. Not only that, an idea that was also recommended by the truly bipartisan Se-

lect Committee on the Modernization of the Congress.

That is what we have before us with H. Con. Res. 44, the Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution.

This measure from Congresswoman RICE of New York is coming before us at an especially important time, a time that finds us discussing matters like the debt ceiling, government spending, transportation, and reconciliation legislation.

It requires the director of the Government Accountability Office to deliver an annual address to a joint hearing of the House and Senate Budget Committees on the financial position and condition of the Federal Government.

Members of the media would be able to cover the hearing so the American people and not just the Members of Congress can better understand the realities about what we face today; all with the goal, Madam Speaker, of promoting greater transparency surrounding our Nation's fiscal health. That way, we have more clarity as Congress makes spending decisions in the months and years ahead that will impact every single American.

A companion measure has already been introduced in the United States Senate, since the House alone cannot tell our friends on the other side of the Capitol what to do; although, I must admit, sometimes I wish we could, Madam Speaker.

There are more than 100 cosponsors of this resolution. As I said earlier, the Select Committee on the Modernization of the Congress has already recommended this concept in their final report of the 116th Congress. I think that is because of a simple reason: We all want to make the most informed spending decisions and develop the most sensible ways to combat our debt.

You can't properly address these issues unless you fully understand them. With this resolution, through the work of the House and Senate Budget Committees, we can all better understand the fiscal reality that we face.

Don't get me wrong, Madam Speaker, I am sure we will still have many debates on this floor about what to do in response. I sure as hell would never support anything that punishes the very Americans who can least afford it.

For example, when we talk about fiscal health, I want us to acknowledge that America's tax code rewards wealth and power at the expense of working families. There has been a dramatic reduction in taxes paid by the very rich in this country over the last 60 years.

So when some say all we need to do is cut, cut, cut, I have to say I get a little confused. I think cutting Medicare, privatizing Social Security, and slashing funding for important programs that help working families is an awful idea.

Instead, I want those at the top to contribute their fair share and pay it

forward so everyone else can access the opportunities and possibilities they get to enjoy.

Let me also say, taking on big problems will cost money. But in the long run, the consequences of an action oftentimes will be more expensive. Hunger is an issue that I deeply care about. It is estimated to cost Americans over \$160 billions every year in lost productivity and poor healthcare outcomes.

In contrast, it would cost us just a fraction of that number to completely end hunger in America. By investing in solutions up front, we can often save a boatload of money and pass on those savings to the American taxpayer.

□ 1245

Now, many Members on my side feel the same way. But I get it. Many of my Republican friends probably view things differently. We can have those debates here on the floor and in the relevant committees. But because of this resolution, hopefully, Democrats and Republicans and Members of the House and Senate would at least be dealing with the same set of facts.

John Adams called facts stubborn things, and I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, he was absolutely right. But sometimes, it can feel like each side uses different statistics to talk past each other.

This measure will, hopefully, help ground our discussions about fiscal policy, so I urge all of my colleagues to join with the more than 100 Members of this body who support this resolution and with the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, which recommended this idea.

Let's allow Members of the House and Senate to hear directly from the GAO so that we can follow the facts and make better informed decisions about our Nation's bottom line.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Con. Res. 44 provides for an annual joint hearing of the House and Senate Budget Committees to hear a presentation by the Comptroller General of the United States reviewing the findings of the audited financial statement of the Federal Government.

I serve both on the House Budget and the House Rules Committees, and I am an original cosponsor of this legislation. It is long past time for the congressional Budget Committees to hear from the Comptroller General, who is the head of the Government Accountability Office. This should be done on an annual basis about the fiscal state of our Nation.

We already hear annually from the executive branch through the head of the Office of Management and Budget. To complement this information, we should also hear an unvarnished, non-political perspective from the head of Congress' legislative support agency

about the many factors contributing to the Nation's debt and deficit in order to develop sound fiscal policies and meet our long-term debt and deficit reduction goals.

Unfortunately, we are in the middle of a spending crisis, with well over \$1 trillion in taxpayer money spent largely on partisan priorities, and the bad news is there is more on the way. The financial effect of this spending on the Federal Government's balance sheet may not be fully realized for several years. It is imperative that we keep close tabs on how our revenues, spending, and debt level are faring.

Congress receives information piecemeal from the executive branch and from the legislative support agencies, so we should have a comprehensive, data-driven analysis and presentation to ensure that our fiscal policies are, in fact, working to ensure the financial health of our Nation, not just in the next 2-year cycle, but for decades into the future as well.

While the legislation before us today was introduced by my Democratic colleague from New York (Miss RICE), it is rooted in the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform from the 115th Congress chaired by my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

This is clearly not a partisan issue, as the legislation has more than 100 cosponsors from both parties. Financial success and longevity begin years before they are realized. We must not be reckless with our Nation's financial future now, and the best way to ensure that is to enact the Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 44, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. KILMER), who is the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair MCGOVERN for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am going to start with a bit of an embarrassing admission. For a number of years, I avoided stepping on a scale because I was about 90 pounds heavier than I am now. Madam Speaker, eventually, I figured out that you can't really get a handle on things by ignoring them. So, occasionally, you have to step on that scale, and that is really the ethic that this bill embraces.

It simply says that if we are going to get a handle on our long-term fiscal challenges and have an economy that works better for everyone, then we have to occasionally hear a clear statement of how we are doing and a clear statement of the Nation's financial realities from a nonpartisan, unbiased source. That is what a fiscal state of the Nation address would do.

As the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress looked at pro-

posals to improve the budget and appropriations process in the 116th Congress, all 12 members of the committee unanimously recommended this as an important reform. I would acknowledge that there was great bipartisan and bicameral support for this notion as part of the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform as well.

The Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress believed that providing Members of Congress with access to nonpartisan information about the many factors contributing to the Nation's fiscal challenges would allow Congress to develop sound fiscal policies and meet the long-term needs of our Nation. In its final report from the 116th Congress, the committee noted that a fiscal state of the Nation address would also encourage communication between the executive and legislative branches and improve the ability for all parties involved in the budget and appropriations process to make decisions based on a common set of facts. That is why this bill has such strong bipartisan support.

I want to congratulate Congresswoman RICE and Congressman BARR for their progress on this effort. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to support this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), who is the respected ranking member of the House Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this resolution about the fiscal state of the Nation is an important step in the right direction. Now more than ever, Congress needs to take an honest look at government spending and the role it is playing in this inflation crisis.

All across America, families are struggling. Consumer prices rose 5.4 percent in September year over year. Inflation is on pace to hit the highest level in 40 years, and the Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that inflation has eroded the purchasing power of families.

Is it any wonder now that only 35 percent of Americans say that the economy is good? I will note that is just a bit smaller than the 37 percent of Americans who believe that President Joe Biden is competent as President.

Make no mistake, the high prices Americans are paying at the grocery store and at the gas pump are a direct result of the Democrats' reckless spending agenda. So it is a little laughable that my Democrat colleagues would bring up this resolution now when for the last 9 months they have rammed through trillions in new spending and debt. As we speak, they are trying to pass the largest tax-and-spending bill in the history—in the history—of our country without even a score from the Congressional Budget Office.

Here is a tip: Be honest with the American people about the price tag of your agenda and the higher prices that will be inflicted. Then a hearing on the state of our Nation's fiscal health will be much more successful.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman I would hate to hear what he would say if he actually opposed the bill. But the bottom line is the bills that we are trying to move through this Chamber right now that would be transformational are fully paid for. I just can't be lectured by anybody who advocated for a tax cut bill that benefited mostly the wealthy and well-off in this country that was not paid for at all and that added \$2 trillion right to our debt. So spare me the lectures.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) in order to continue the lectures, and who is a valuable member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, my thanks to my colleague from Texas for giving me the opportunity to speak on this very important subject.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, though I have to admit that it is easy to be somewhat pessimistic about its potential effectiveness. But I am willing to try anything—anything—that might work in elevating the Nation's debt situation in the minds of the people we all represent.

The people I represent in Arkansas don't have a choice but to balance their checkbooks, and if they can't, then they are limited in how much they can borrow and for what. Sadly, the Federal Government doesn't play by the same rules.

Madam Speaker, we are \$29 trillion in debt. We have budget deficits as far as the eyes can see. We are mortgaging the futures of our kids and our grandkids. And it is painfully obvious to me that the governing majority doesn't really care much about deficits and debt. But Third District Arkansans do.

I had the honor of co-chairing a joint select committee in 2018 that tried to address the budget and appropriations process that has tripped up the Congress every year since I have been here, and to think that we are only funded through the third day of December, with no assurance of a full year's appropriation by then, something has to be done.

A fiscal state of the Union is one of the recommendations that came from our joint select committee, but I will remind everyone that we need three more—count them, three more—Democrat votes to move those recommendations. And four, Madam Speaker, four Democrats voted “present.”

So forgive me if I don't sound terribly optimistic that Congress will get its act together. But maybe, just

maybe, something like this will force a rational discussion before we have what is coming: a sovereign debt crisis.

So, I am willing to try, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman this is a bipartisan bill put forward by a bipartisan commission, and I am glad to hear him talking about the debt. I wish some of my colleagues would have talked about it when they controlled the House and the White House, but the debt that we are talking about was accumulated by Republican Presidents and Republican Congresses and Democratic Presidents and Democratic Congresses.

President Biden has only been in office 9 months, and the spending that he is proposing is to be fully paid for, with a recognition that we do not want to see an increase in our deficits and our debt.

But this is a bipartisan moment, and we should celebrate it. But maybe I am sounding a little eccentric when I say that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

So, Madam Speaker, in closing, this legislation will provide the congressional Budget Committees with an unbiased, analytical understanding of the audited financial statement of the Federal Government.

We know problems remain in completing this audit, as the Department of Defense has yet to receive a full financial audit opinion. To ensure that this statutorily required audit is achieved and to gain a comprehensive understanding of the financial health of the Federal Government, we certainly must pass the Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is a bipartisan resolution. It was presented to us by a bipartisan select committee. I think we should all appreciate this particular moment.

It is about making sure that Congress is provided a presentation of the facts about our Nation's fiscal health as we make decisions that will impact America's bottom line. Democrats and Republicans could then fight it out over the next steps. We have different priorities and different values on a lot of things.

□ 1300

But there should be no disagreement about this resolution right now. And, surely, even in this day and age, we can all still agree on the need to get the facts in the light of day for us and the people who we represent.

Again, I want to thank Congresswoman RICE from New York for her

leadership on this issue, and I want to thank my colleague on the Rules Committee Congressman BURGESS for cosponsoring this legislation. There should be no controversy over this.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H. Con. Res. 44, the Fiscal State of the Nation resolution.

This resolution would require the Comptroller General of the United States to present an annual report on the fiscal health of the federal government to a joint hearing of the House and Senate Budget Committees, open to ALL members of Congress.

This nonpartisan presentation will offer an objective analysis of the nation's finances and allow Congress to demonstrate to the public that we are serious about improving our fiscal decision-making.

As we finalize historic investments to rebuild our infrastructure and help families and small businesses recover from this pandemic, it is more important than ever that we act as responsible stewards of the American people's tax dollars.

Every lawmaker, citizen, and media outlet should be able to reference a single, unbiased source when discussing the current and future fiscal health of our country. And the Fiscal State of the Nation would provide that valuable information with transparency and accuracy.

I'm incredibly proud this bipartisan resolution has garnered over 100 cosponsors, almost evenly split between Democratic and Republican members.

I'd like to thank my friend, Representative ANDY BARR from Kentucky, for co-leading this legislation with me, and I urge its swift passage on the Floor today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAZARD ELIGIBILITY AND LOCAL PROJECTS ACT

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1917) to modify eligibility requirements for certain hazard mitigation assistance programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1917

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects Act”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO BEGIN IMPLEMENTATION OF ACQUISITION OR RELOCATION PROJECTS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE FOR INITIATED PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity seeking assistance under a hazard mitigation assistance program shall be eligible to receive such assistance for a covered project if the entity—

(A) complies with all other eligibility requirements of the hazard mitigation assistance program for acquisition or relocation projects, including extinguishing all incompatible encumbrances; and

(B) complies with all Federal requirements for the project.

(2) COSTS INCURRED.—An entity seeking assistance under a hazard mitigation assistance program shall be responsible for any project costs incurred by the entity for a covered project if the covered project is not awarded, or is determined to be ineligible for, assistance.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) COVERED PROJECT.—The term “covered project” means—

(A) an acquisition or relocation project for which an entity began implementation prior to grant award under a hazard mitigation assistance program; and

(B) a project for which an entity initiated planning or construction before or after requesting assistance for the project under a hazard mitigation assistance program qualifying for a categorical exemption under the National Environmental Policy Act.

(2) HAZARD MITIGATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The term “hazard mitigation assistance program” means—

(A) the predisaster hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133);

(B) the hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c); and

(C) the flood mitigation assistance program authorized under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c).

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to funds appropriated on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1917, introduced and championed by Representative FLETCHER. The Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects, or HELP Act, is designed to cut through red tape to unlock Federal assistance to State and local governments to complete some of the most basic mitigation projects more efficiently, such as buyouts of flood-prone properties. It

represents a change to the current law's one-size-fits-all approach to reviewing projects that frequently delays mitigation work which will be welcome news to communities across my State in New Hampshire, and across our country as we deal with more frequent severe weather events that may require a Federal response.

The National Institute of Building Sciences has conducted significant analysis on the return on investment to taxpayers for investments in mitigation. Congress, under both Democratic and Republican majorities, has seen fit to bolster investments in mitigation to drive down future disaster response and recovery costs.

Just last week, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee marked up the Resilient AMERICA Act which would align the calculation used to fund the Federal Emergency Management Agency's pre-disaster mitigation program with the agency's post-disaster mitigation program.

FEMA's longest-running mitigation program, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, or HMGP, began in 1989 and provides assistance after a disaster has struck. While there have been more than \$5.2 billion obligated to HMGP projects, more than \$1 billion in HMGP dollars have gone unobligated and will return to FEMA.

This bill will help disaster-impacted communities complete the land acquisition and simple construction projects that would otherwise be categorically exempt from a NEPA review, streamlining the process with FEMA. I want to commend Congresswoman FLETCHER for her efforts to help disaster-vulnerable communities quicken the pace of recoveries and mitigate against future events.

I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 1, 2021.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1917, the Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that by foregoing formal consideration on H.R. 1917, the Committee on Financial Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claims to provisions in this or similar legislation, and that your Committee will be consulted and involved on any matters in your Committee's jurisdiction should this legislation move forward. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving provisions within this legislation on which the Committee on Financial Services has a valid jurisdictional claim.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of H.R. 1917.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFazio,
Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, November 1, 2021.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1917, the “Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects Act.” In order to permit H.R. 1917 to proceed expeditiously to the House Floor, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 1917 in light of our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 1917 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward with regard to any matters in the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation that involves the Committee's jurisdiction and request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during Floor consideration of H.R. 1917.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1917, the Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects Act.

This bipartisan legislation will let communities recover from disasters more efficiently, and even more importantly, better prepare these communities for the next disaster.

H.R. 1917 provides assistance for certain mitigation projects that began before the grant was applied for. Last Congress, the House also worked in a bipartisan manner to pass this very practical bill under suspension of the rules. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to bring my bill, H.R. 1917, the Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects, or HELP Act, to the floor today, and I thank Congressman PAPPAS, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for agreeing to move this bill forward. I am so proud of the HELP Act and all that it represents. It is bipartisan, commonsense, meaningful legislation, that was born out of a real partnership with local officials in my district in

Houston that will benefit all Americans.

As many in this body will recall, Hurricane Harvey hit my district in Houston and the entire Texas Gulf Coast in August of 2017, causing great devastation, dropping nearly 60 inches of rain, claiming 68 lives, and causing an estimated \$125 billion in damages. It was the second-most expensive hurricane in the United States' history. Members of this body responded to Harvey's devastation with the speed and purpose we needed for our recovery, passing three supplemental appropriations bills, sending billions of dollars in aid to Texas through different programs. But our recovery was and still is slow, slower than many expected, and slower than any can afford.

Before I was sworn into Congress, I met with our local officials at home to talk about the impediments to our recovery. How could we speed it up? Where was recovery delayed? What could the Federal Government do? And one impediment that had significant impact on our recovery was the process for the award of mitigation project funding from FEMA.

Here is why. As Mr. PAPPAS noted, section 404 of the Stafford Act provides that FEMA may grant up to 75 percent of funds for cost-effective mitigation projects through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, HMGP. When States or municipalities apply through the HMGP program, projects, regardless of size or scope, require a comprehensive review to make sure all requirements of NEPA or other statutory requirements are met.

Importantly, these hazard mitigation grants do not allow for the reimbursement of costs incurred before a grant is approved. As a result, many areas recovering from disaster must wait for the FEMA review before purchasing land or starting construction on a project designed to mitigate damage. This FEMA review can go on for months or years at a critical time for decisionmaking and recovering.

In the case of natural disasters, local governments need to move quickly on projects like land acquisition; for example, buying land or buying out homes that have been damaged or other land acquisition projects. In Houston, this was true for us when we were looking to buy a golf course to create additional stormwater detention. The chief recovery officer for the city of Houston has told us that FEMA's pre-award cost policy—that is, not allowing reimbursement of costs incurred before grant approval—is a limiting factor in recovery, especially in cases of land acquisition.

Homeowners simply cannot afford to wait the months or years to make decisions about whether to repair their homes or participate in a buyout. The result is not only inefficiency, but real hardship.

For example, Harris County Flood Control District received \$25 million from the Hazard Mitigation Grant Pro-

gram to conduct buyouts to reduce flood damages in areas located deep in the floodplain where structural projects to reduce flooding aren't cost-effective. But that was nearly a year after Harvey. It took a year because of the review period required at FEMA for all HMGP applications. Most homeowners simply don't have the luxury of waiting a year or more to begin repairs or decide what to do.

So the quicker local governments are able to move, the more people they can help and the more resources they can leverage. Having a one-size-fits-all approach to reviewing projects through the HMGP is not efficient or effective. It needlessly delays critical mitigation work.

That is where the idea for the HELP Act came from. The HELP Act will allow land acquisition projects and simple construction projects that do not require an environmental impact statement under NEPA to commence immediately without the risk of losing potential Federal funds. This will allow State and local governments to respond more quickly to the needs of their communities and to plan disaster mitigation more efficiently and effectively by removing unnecessary delays and streamlining FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. It is simple, it is straightforward, and it is needed.

At home, I continue to hear a consistent concern that these Federal disaster recovery projects move at a very slow pace. This bill addresses that and will be a real improvement for communities across the country.

I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. McCAUL, for working with me on this bill. Disaster mitigation is not and should never be a partisan issue. There remains much work to do to prepare for future storms that we know will come, but I am hopeful that the HELP Act will aid State and local governments when they do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and help our families, businesses, and communities recover from disasters.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time as I have no additional speakers.

In closing, H.R. 1917 benefits our communities by allowing them to be eligible for Federal disaster mitigation assistance for projects started prior to their request for assistance. I believe that this bill is a good bill, and I urge support of this bipartisan legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman FLETCHER again for her leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to pass this commonsense piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1917.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

□ 1315

ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY COORDINATION AND LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1339) to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish an advanced air mobility interagency working group, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1339

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act".

SEC. 2. ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY WORKING GROUP.

(a) **WORKING GROUP.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall establish an advanced air mobility interagency working group (in this section referred to as the "working group").

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the working group established under subsection (a) shall be to plan and coordinate efforts related to the safety, operations, infrastructure, physical security, cybersecurity, and Federal investment necessary for maturation of the AAM ecosystem in the United States. It is critical that Government agencies collaborate in order to enhance United States leadership, develop new transportation options, amplify economic activity and jobs, advance environmental sustainability and new technologies, and support emergency preparedness and competitiveness.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—Not later than 60 days after the establishment of the working group under subsection (a), the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) appoint the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy to chair the working group;

(2) designate not less than one additional representative to participate on the working group from each of—

(A) the Department of Transportation; and
(B) the Federal Aviation Administration; and
(3) invite the heads of each of the following departments or agencies to designate not less than 1 representative to participate on the working group, including—

(A) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;
(B) the Department of Defense;
(C) the Department of Energy;
(D) the Department of Homeland Security;
(E) the Department of Commerce;
(F) the Federal Communications Commission;

and
(G) such other departments or agencies as the Secretary of Transportation determines appropriate.

(d) COORDINATION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Transportation and Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall coordinate with aviation industry and labor stakeholders, stakeholder associations, and others determined appropriate by the Secretary of Transportation

and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, including the following:

(A) Manufacturers of aircraft, avionics, propulsion systems, and air traffic management systems.

(B) Intended operators of AAM aircraft.

(C) Commercial air carriers, commercial operators, and general aviation operators, including helicopter operators.

(D) Airports, heliports, and fixed-base operators.

(E) Aviation training and maintenance providers.

(F) Certified labor representatives of pilots, air traffic control specialists employed by the Federal Aviation Administration, aircraft mechanics, and aviation safety inspectors.

(G) State, local, and Tribal officials or public agencies.

(H) First responders.

(I) Groups representing environmental interests.

(J) Electric utilities, energy providers, energy market operators, and wireless providers.

(K) Unmanned aircraft system operators and service suppliers.

(L) Groups representing consumer interests.

(M) Groups representing the interests of taxpayers.

(2) **ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—The Secretary of Transportation and Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may use such Federal advisory committees as may be appropriate to coordinate with the entities listed in paragraph (1).

(e) **REVIEW AND EXAMINATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the working group under subsection (a), the working group shall complete a review and examination of, at a minimum—

(1) steps that will mature AAM aircraft operations, concepts, and regulatory frameworks beyond initial operations;

(2) safety requirements and physical and cybersecurity involved with future air traffic management concepts which may be considered as part of the evolution of AAM to higher levels of traffic density;

(3) current Federal programs and policies that may be leveraged to advance the maturation of the AAM industry;

(4) infrastructure, including aviation, multimodal, cybersecurity, and utility infrastructure, necessary to accommodate and support expanded operations of AAM after initial implementation;

(5) anticipated benefits associated with AAM aircraft operations, including economic, environmental, emergency and natural disaster response, and transportation benefits; and

(6) other factors that may limit the full potential of the AAM industry, including community acceptance of AAM operations.

(f) **PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Based on the review and examination performed under subsection (e), the working group shall develop—

(1) recommendations regarding the safety, operations, security, cybersecurity, infrastructure, and other Federal investment or actions necessary to support the evolution of early AAM to higher levels of activity and societal benefit; and

(2) a comprehensive plan detailing the roles and responsibilities of each Federal department or agency to facilitate or implement the recommendations in paragraph (1).

(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the review and examination completed under subsection (e), the working group shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that—

(1) details the review and examination performed under subsection (e); and

(2) provides the plan and recommendations developed under subsection (f).

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this Act:

(1) **ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY; AAM.**—The terms “advanced air mobility” and “AAM” mean a transportation system that transports people and property by air between two points in the United States using aircraft, including electric aircraft or electric vertical take-off and landing aircraft, in both controlled and uncontrolled airspace.

(2) **ELECTRIC AIRCRAFT.**—The term “electric aircraft” means an aircraft with a fully electric or hybrid (fuel and electric) driven propulsion system used for flight.

(3) **FIXED-BASE OPERATOR.**—The term “fixed-base operator” means a business granted the right by an airport sponsor or heliport sponsor to operate on an airport or heliport and provide aeronautical services, including fueling and charging, aircraft hangaring, tiedown and parking, aircraft rental, aircraft maintenance, and flight instruction.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code.

(5) **VERTICAL TAKE-OFF AND LANDING.**—The term “vertical take-off and landing” means an aircraft with lift/thrust units used to generate powered lift and control and with two or more lift/thrust units used to provide lift during vertical take-off or landing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 1339, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS) as well as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Once viewed as only a figment of people's imagination, flying cars are now on the verge of becoming a reality and will take to the skies in no time, thanks to recent innovations in aircraft and propulsion technology. Advanced air mobility, or AAM, vehicles have the potential to alleviate traffic congestion, reduce the current burden on surface infrastructure, create good-paying U.S. jobs, and provide a more environmentally sustainable mode of daily transportation. In fact, last year, my home State of New Hampshire became the first State to safely allow roadable aircraft to use our roads, once they become certified for travel.

But as these new aircraft emerge in an already complex U.S. airspace, we must ensure that they are safe, both for those on board and those on the ground.

H.R. 1339, the Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act, would establish an interagency work-

ing group, bringing together the Federal Government, States and localities, the aerospace industry, labor unions, and other key stakeholders to plan and coordinate efforts to safely integrate AAM operations in our national airspace system.

The interagency working group's recommendations on safety, security, and infrastructure needs will help support the deployment of this technology and advance U.S. leadership in this emerging global industry. This legislation has support from both sides of the aisle and the endorsement of several organizations representing the U.S. aviation and aerospace sector.

Madam Speaker, I support this bipartisan bill, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1339, the Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act.

I want to thank the sponsors of this legislation for introducing this very important bill. The bill directs the Department of Transportation to form a working group with other Federal agencies to ensure that the advanced air mobility industry has the Federal backing it needs to commence operations and to succeed.

I recently had the opportunity to fly a simulated advanced air mobility, or AAM, flight and was very impressed with the technology.

In just a few short years, we may be seeing multiple companies carrying paying passengers in highly automated electric vertical takeoff and landing aircraft.

These operations will connect cities, towns, and neighborhoods all across the country in a very safe, quiet, and environmentally friendly way.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill and keeps the momentum going for American leadership in the advanced air mobility industry. That is why I support H.R. 1339, and I urge a “yes” vote today.

Madam Speaker, before I reserve, I also want to pay tribute to Holly Woodruff Lyons, our longtime Subcommittee on Aviation staff director. After nearly 20 years on the committee, Holly will be retiring at the end of this year.

It is hard to imagine the committee without Holly. Each new Republican chairman or ranking member has received the same advice from their predecessor: whatever you do, make sure Holly stays. I am sorry to say that the streak has finally ended on my watch, but her legacy will cast a long shadow in these halls for years to come.

Holly has helped shape every single piece of aviation legislation in the past two decades, and she is responsible for literally hundreds of provisions in law that have improved the lives of everyday Americans.

Holly is a consummate professional and dedicated staffer, and we will sorely miss her counsel and very much miss her wisdom.

I am personally grateful for her service to this committee, both as a pilot and a Member of Congress.

I thank her so much for dedicating her career to aviation safety and her service to the American public. She will never be a stranger around here, and I hope she and Mark make the most of their well-earned retirements. I thank her for all she has done.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. GRAVES for yielding to Mr. GRAVES.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to thank our sponsor on this legislation, Congresswoman SHARICE DAVIDS, for working with us on this.

Congress is often the body that comes in and proposes legislation and then proposes solutions after something has happened, after something bad has happened. This is a different approach. This is Congress actually stepping in and being proactive.

This is bipartisan legislation that recognizes the United States leads the world in innovation related to aviation. The only way we are going to be able to do that, that we are going to be able to continue leading the world with these advanced technologies related to advanced air mobility, is by being proactive in this case.

We are talking about incorporating innovative technology that is going to effect virtually every aspect of our lives, but integrating it into one of the most complex and one of the most congested airspace areas in the world. This isn't something we can just do overnight once the technology is ready.

This legislation puts together a working group for us to look at how this is going to be integrated, what regulations we need in place, what infrastructure changes we need to have in place in order to facilitate this.

Madam Speaker, we can't cede this technology, this innovation, to other countries. The United States has the safest, most advanced aviation system in the world, but we are not going to be able to maintain that without being proactive, without thinking through all of the integration that is going to result; again, whether it be infrastructure or people who want to use urban air mobility to fly from one city to the other. In my home State of Louisiana, flying from Baton Rouge to New Orleans, as opposed to sitting in the parking lot that is Interstate 10 or those people that want to fly from Lake Charles to Houston for the day, because they don't want to live in Hous-

ton, and fly back and spend the night in Lake Charles. I am kidding, Texas friends.

Madam Speaker, the people that work in the offshore industry, the ability to fly through advanced air mobility to these facilities and come back, doing it safer; doing it with less fuel, less emissions; doing it more efficiently, less expensive; that is what this solution, this technology, potentially provides for us.

There have been studies that show that by 2035, this industry could employ 280,000 people, and the value of this industry sector could be \$115 billion.

Once again, Madam Speaker, we are not going to realize those benefits without us being proactive and facilitating the integration of this technology into our communities.

Madam Speaker, even our military, the Department of Defense, recognizes the potential of eVTOL technology in its own operations, and that is why it is investing in the Agility Prime program to help foster the AAM industry.

The issues that we are looking at include aircraft certification, ground infrastructure, air traffic control, battery storage, cybersecurity, physical security, spectrum, and many other challenges. This legislation helps to ensure that we have solutions in place when the technology is ready.

Again, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the vice chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, SHARICE DAVIDS, for her leadership and partnership in sponsoring the bill. I appreciate the work of Ranking Member SAM GRAVES and Chairman DEFAZIO in allowing us to move this forward in a bipartisan manner.

Madam Speaker, before I yield back, I also want to recognize one of the hardworking heroes and unsung heroes of this Congress. I want to take a few minutes to honor our Aviation Subcommittee Republican staff director Holly Woodruff Lyons, who will be retiring at the end of the year.

Holly was raised in sunny southern California, and she made the inexplicable decision to choose to go to Colgate University in freezing cold Upstate New York. I think she quickly realized the error of her ways and transitioned to the University of San Diego School of Law for law school.

She did some time in private practice, and then she began her federal service over 20 years ago, in 1999, where she followed in her father's footsteps and worked for the Federal Aviation Administration in the Airports and Environmental Law Division.

Holly came to the Aviation Subcommittee as counsel in May of 2002 under then-Chairman DON YOUNG. Madam Speaker, also having worked for the dean of the House, I also question that decision.

When considering whether to take the job, Holly wondered whether she was too old to start a career on Capitol Hill. But her first subcommittee staff

director saw there was something special about Holly, and he told us that one of the best decisions he ever made was recommending Holly to the committee.

Holly became the Aviation Subcommittee staff director in 2007, where she remained for most of the last 14 years, working under Chairman Mica, Chairman Shuster, and now Ranking Member SAM GRAVES. She did, however, spend a brief time as deputy general counsel to the full committee before returning to her rightful place in the subcommittee.

She made invaluable contributions, as the ranking member noted, to every aviation legislative effort over the past 20 years, including the Homeland Security Act of 2002; the Vision 100—Century Aviation Reauthorization Act; the Cape Town Treaty Implementation Act of 2004; the NTSB Reauthorization Act of 2006, and the Airline Safety and Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act of 2010. She served as the lead House negotiator on the European Union ETS Prohibition Act of 2011; the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012; the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016; and the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018. Recently, last Congress, she was also the lead House Republican negotiator on the 2020 Aircraft Certification, Safety, and Accountability Act.

In each one of these efforts, Holly has been a model staffer. She is professional, intelligent, conscientious, and hardworking. She is an excellent and fierce negotiator, as everyone who has had the pleasure of sitting on her side of the table, or misfortune of sitting on the other side of the table, knows. She fights for every advantage at every turn while remaining disarmingly pleasant and entirely unflappable.

In one memorable negotiation, though, Holly leaned forward, made a circle with her fingers, and told another committee in no uncertain terms that they had zero jurisdiction over a certain topic. As one former committee staff director is fond of saying: Holly plays for keeps.

Madam Speaker, there are two kinds of people that work on Capitol Hill: Those that have been schooled by Holly and those that will be.

But the reason everyone loves a good war story about Holly is that it contrasts so much with her usual personality. She is friendly, kind, approachable, and always ready to help. She has been a wonderful mentor and friend to junior committee staff. She has almost singlehandedly trained and mentored an entire generation of transportation and aviation policy professionals. There is no one who has worked with or for Holly who can say they haven't learned from her.

Madam Speaker, we often say that aviation is the safest form of transportation, as though that is the way it has always been. When we get on a plane, we don't have to think about whether it is safe or not because of the incredible hard work of people like Holly and

what they have done over the decades. It is only when we look back over the career of someone like Holly where we can see how much things have changed for the better. Without question, aviation is safer today than it has ever been, in no small part through the work of Holly Woodruff Lyons.

We thank Holly so much for her service to the committee, her service to the House of Representatives, and her service to the American people. Her work has saved lives and made this country a better, safer, and more prosperous place. We are sad to see her go, but we will not say goodbye. We still have her cellphone number. Instead, we will say, see you soon. We wish her and Mark all the best as they start this next chapter of their life.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, we thank Holly as well for her contributions to the House and to this important issue area and wish her all best in her next steps.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, in closing, this legislation takes an important step in preparing the Federal Government and our communities for the introduction of advanced air mobility vehicles.

Madam Speaker, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this commonsense legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1339, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

□ 1330

ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO RURAL INTERNET DEVELOPMENT GRANT ELIGIBILITY ACT

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3193) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for a high-speed broadband deployment initiative, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3193

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Eliminating Barriers to Rural Internet Development

Grant Eligibility Act” or the “E-BRIDGE Act”.

SEC. 2. HIGH-SPEED BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 219. HIGH-SPEED BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT INITIATIVE.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BROADBAND PROJECT.—The term ‘broadband project’ means, for the purpose of providing, extending, expanding, or improving high-speed broadband service to further the goals of this Act—

“(A) planning, technical assistance, or training;

“(B) the acquisition or development of land; or

“(C) the acquisition, design and engineering, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of facilities, including related machinery, equipment, contractual rights, and intangible property.

“(2) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible recipient’ means an eligible recipient.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘eligible recipient’ includes—

“(i) a public-private partnership; and

“(ii) a consortium formed for the purpose of providing, extending, expanding, or improving high-speed broadband service between 1 or more eligible recipients and 1 or more for-profit organizations.

“(3) HIGH-SPEED BROADBAND.—The term ‘high-speed broadband’ means the provision of 2-way data transmission with sufficient downstream and upstream speeds to end users to permit effective participation in the economy and to support economic growth, as determined by the Secretary.

“(b) BROADBAND PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On the application of an eligible recipient, the Secretary may make grants under this title for broadband projects, which shall be subject to the provisions of this section.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In reviewing applications submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration geographic diversity of grants allocated, including consideration of underserved markets, in addition to data requested in paragraph (3).

“(3) DATA REQUESTED.—In reviewing an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall request from the Federal Communications Commission, the Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Appalachian Regional Commission data on—

“(A) the level and extent of broadband service that exists in the area proposed to be served; and

“(B) the level and extent of broadband service that will be deployed in the area proposed to be served pursuant to another Federal program.

“(4) INTEREST IN REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY.—For any broadband project carried out by an eligible recipient that is a public-private partnership or consortium, the Secretary shall require that title to any real or personal property acquired or improved with grant funds, or if the recipient will not acquire title, another possessory interest acceptable to the Secretary, be vested in a public partner or eligible nonprofit organization or association for the useful life of the project, after which title may be transferred to any member of the public-private partnership or consortium in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

“(5) PROCUREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person or entity

shall be disqualified from competing to provide goods or services related to a broadband project on the basis that the person or entity participated in the development of the broadband project or in the drafting of specifications, requirements, statements of work, or similar documents related to the goods or services to be provided.

“(6) BROADBAND PROJECT PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may permit a recipient of a grant for a broadband project to grant an option to acquire real or personal property (including contractual rights and intangible property) related to that project to a third party on such terms as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, subject to the condition that the option may only be exercised after the Secretary releases the Federal interest in the property.

“(B) TREATMENT.—The grant or exercise of an option described in subparagraph (A) shall not constitute a redistribution of grant funds under section 217.

“(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of the cost of a broadband project, the Secretary may provide credit toward the non-Federal share for the present value of allowable contributions over the useful life of the broadband project, subject to the condition that the Secretary may require such assurances of the value of the rights and of the commitment of the rights as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 89-136) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 218 the following:

“Sec. 219. High-speed broadband deployment initiative.”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3193, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3193, the Eliminating Barriers to Rural Internet Development Grant Eligibility, or E-BRIDGE, Act.

Introduced by Ranking Member GRAVES and Representative GUEST, the bill would create a high-speed

broadband initiative at the Economic Development Administration and clarify that public-private partnerships and consortiums are eligible for broadband project grant awards.

Access to reliable high-speed internet is vital for participation in today's workforce and economy. Whether it is working or learning from home, communicating virtually with friends and family, shopping online, or consulting with your doctor remotely, almost every aspect of our daily lives now relies on a connection to the internet.

Unfortunately, millions of people across the country still don't have access to high-speed internet. In my home State of New Hampshire, 10 percent of households lack an internet subscription. This problem is especially prevalent in rural America.

According to a study by the Pew Research Center, almost 30 percent of rural Americans don't have access to high-speed broadband internet services at home. This poses challenges for our small businesses, for students, for families.

Passing this legislation will help our rural communities thrive by removing existing barriers to internet development.

EDA already has the authority to award grants to fund the deployment of broadband infrastructure in communities in most need of assistance, but many communities lack the financial and technical resources necessary to properly develop broadband deployment strategies.

In order to effectively deploy broadband projects in the last mile, local communities must have the flexibility to collaborate with public-private partnerships and consortiums in developing these proposals. By clarifying that public-private partnerships and consortiums are eligible for EDA grants, H.R. 3193 ensures that communities can leverage private-sector expertise without disqualifying them from receiving assistance.

This bill also provides grant applicants with additional flexibility in financing broadband infrastructure projects by clarifying that funds can be combined with other Federal resources and allowing real or personal property to count toward the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for introducing this critical legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, November 3, 2021.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 3193, the "E-BRIDGE Act." In order to permit H.R. 3193 to proceed expeditiously to the House Floor, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of H.R. 3193 in light of our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 3193 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject

matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward with regard to any matters in the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation that involves the Committee's jurisdiction and request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 3193.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, November 3, 2021.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3193, the E-BRIDGE Act. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that by foregoing formal consideration on H.R. 3193, the Committee on Financial Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claims to provisions in this or similar legislation, and that your Committee will be consulted and involved on any matters in your Committee's jurisdiction should this legislation move forward. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving provisions within this legislation on which the Committee on Financial Services has a valid jurisdictional claim.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3193.

Sincerely,

PETER DEFAZIO,
Chair.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be the sponsor of H.R. 3193, the Eliminating Barriers to Rural Internet Development Grant Eligibility Act, or E-BRIDGE, along with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST).

Unfortunately, too many of our communities, particularly in rural America, still lack broadband access. Broadband is critical to conducting business and attracting jobs for telehealth, education, and emergency preparedness and response efforts in this digital age.

While Economic Development Administration, or EDA, grants may already be used to attract jobs in economically distressed areas, there are hurdles to using these grants for broadband projects, including difficult last-mile efforts that often delay rural broadband development. This bill removes those hurdles to help connect and revitalize our rural communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST).

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I would first like to thank Ranking Member GRAVES for his leadership on this important piece of legislation that would eliminate hurdles and leverage Economic Development Administration dollars to invest in broadband deployment across America's rural communities.

By utilizing public-private partnerships and consortia between internet service providers and economic development agencies, EDA dollars could be leveraged to deploy broadband and spur modern economic development for rural and economically distressed communities.

Many of these consortia exist within the private sector, including many large corporations working to deploy broadband across vast rural areas. However, EDA funds have been held back from small towns and communities working to attract private investment in their communities. The E-BRIDGE Act would directly respond to the needs of these communities and provide flexibility to leverage in-kind services and other Federal resources.

The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated the necessity of the internet in our lives and the need to close the digital divide that exists between rural and urban areas. This bill is supported by The App Association, American Farm Bureau, and the National Association of Development Organizations.

I appreciate the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

H.R. 3193 is going to ensure that rural and economically distressed communities are equipped to use EDA grants to develop high-speed broadband access. I feel very strongly about this bill, and I urge support of this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRAVES and Mr. GUEST for their leadership on this important issue. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3193, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PRELIMINARY DAMAGE ASSESSMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3709) to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit to Congress a report on preliminary damage assessments and make necessary improvements to processes in the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3709

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Preliminary Damage Assessment Improvement Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Preliminary damage assessments play a critical role in assessing and validating the impact and magnitude of a disaster.

(2) Through the preliminary damage assessment process, representatives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency validate information gathered by State and local officials that serves as the basis for disaster assistance requests.

(3) Various factors can impact the duration of a preliminary damage assessment and the corresponding submission of a major disaster request, however, the average time between when a disaster occurs, and the submission of a corresponding disaster request has been found to be approximately twenty days longer for flooding disasters.

(4) With communities across the country facing increased instances of catastrophic flooding and other extreme weather events, accurate and efficient preliminary damage assessments have become critically important to the relief process for impacted States and municipalities.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to Congress a report describing the preliminary damage assessment process, as supported by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in the 5 years before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report described in subsection (a) shall contain the following:

(1) The process of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for deploying personnel to support preliminary damage assessments.

(2) The number of Agency staff participating on disaster assessment teams.

(3) The training and experience of such staff described in paragraph (2).

(4) A calculation of the average amount of time disaster assessment teams described in paragraph (1) are deployed to a disaster area.

(5) The efforts of the Agency to maintain a consistent liaison between the Agency and

State, local, tribal, and territorial officials within a disaster area.

SEC. 4. PRELIMINARY DAMAGE ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall convene an advisory panel consisting of emergency management personnel employed by State, local, territorial, or tribal authorities, and the representative organizations of such personnel to assist the Agency in improving critical components of the preliminary damage assessment process.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This advisory panel shall consist of at least 2 representatives from national emergency management organizations and at least 1 representative from each of the 10 regions of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, selected from emergency management personnel employed by State, local, territorial, or tribal authorities within each region.

(2) INCLUSION ON PANEL.—To the furthest extent practicable, representation on the advisory panel shall include emergency management personnel from both rural and urban jurisdictions.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—The advisory panel convened under subsection (a) shall—

(1) consider—

(A) establishing a training regime to ensure preliminary damage assessments are conducted and reviewed under consistent guidelines;

(B) utilizing a common technological platform to integrate data collected by State and local governments with data collected by the Agency; and

(C) assessing instruction materials provided by the Agency for omissions of pertinent information or language that conflicts with other statutory requirements; and

(2) identify opportunities for streamlining the consideration of preliminary damage assessments by the Agency, including eliminating duplicative paperwork requirements and ensuring consistent communication and decision making among Agency staff.

(d) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report regarding the findings of the advisory panel, steps that will be undertaken by the Agency to implement the findings of the advisory panel, and additional legislation that may be necessary to implement the findings of the advisory panel.

(e) RULEMAKING AND FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall issue such regulations as are necessary to implement the recommendations of the advisory panel and submit to Congress a report discussing—

(1) the implementation of recommendations from the advisory panel;

(2) the identification of any additional challenges to the preliminary damage assessment process, including whether specific disasters result in longer preliminary damage assessments; and

(3) any additional legislative recommendations necessary to improve the preliminary damage assessment process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3709.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3709, introduced and championed by Representatives KATKO and DELGADO, two colleagues of ours on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

The Preliminary Damage Assessment, or PDA, Improvement Act would direct the Federal Emergency Management Agency to produce a report examining the PDA process and establish a more consistent training regime for FEMA personnel to effectively support State and local officials as they conduct these assessments in the wake of disaster.

FEMA uses PDA findings to determine the extent of damage and the subsequent unmet needs of individuals, businesses, and the public sector in a disaster-impacted area.

This bill will ensure greater consistency of PDAs across FEMA's 10 regions by creating a training program with a goal of ensuring a more consistent process of data collection and analysis.

As communities across the country experience more extreme weather events, consistent and timely PDAs are more important than ever to the recovery process.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation and ask my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3709, the Preliminary Damage Assessment Improvement Act of 2021, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO).

FEMA's preliminary disaster assessment is crucial when determining eligibility for disaster assistance. This bill will ensure State and local stakeholders are involved in reviewing and developing recommendations for improving this process. This bill will help reduce unnecessary delays and get assistance to disaster survivors more quickly so they can recover faster and move forward with their lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

H.R. 3709 makes disaster recovery easier for victims by improving State and local communities' abilities to coordinate with FEMA when determining the impacts of major disasters.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this important bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I want to commend again my fellow committee members for introducing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3709.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

MODIFYING PURCHASE TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BARGAIN-PRICE OPTIONS

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2220) to amend title 40, United States Code, to modify the treatment of certain bargain-price options to purchase at less than fair market value, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2220

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON DISCOUNTED PURCHASE OPTIONS.

Section 585 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) Any bargain-price option to purchase at less than fair market value contained in any lease agreement entered into on or after January 1, 2021, pursuant to this section may be exercised only to the extent specifically provided for in subsequent appropriation Acts or other Acts of Congress.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2220.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2220, introduced by Representatives GUEST, WEBSTER, and PENCE, requires the General Services Administration to secure congressional authorization before it can exercise a prenegotiated purchase option in an operating lease.

Currently, OMB rules stipulate that a lease cannot be scored as an operating lease if it contains a prenegotiated bargain-price purchase option. Operating leases allow agencies to budget their rent outlays annually, whereas capital leases require the agency to budget, upfront, the entire net present value of all rental obligations it will incur over the duration of the lease term. Unless GSA has full, upfront appropriations in hand, the agency must rely on operating leases that can be paid for year by year.

But preventing an operating lease from containing a prenegotiated bargain-price purchase option means that if GSA wants to acquire the building at the end of the lease, the agency must pay fair market value instead of being able to negotiate a sales price at the beginning of the lease. In essence, the Federal Government ends up paying for the building twice, once when it leases the building and once when it purchases the building at the end of the lease at the current market rate.

The scoring rules are designed to ensure that ownership risk stays with the lessor and that the lease isn't a mechanism by which the government finances its ownership of the property. But the effect is that the Federal Government is overpaying for buildings and not getting the benefit of equity that it has created for private-sector landlords.

It is time to give GSA the flexibility it needs to make savvy financial deals for the Federal Government. I urge adoption of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2220, which would allow the General Services Administration, or GSA, to enter into bargain-price purchasing agreements in situations where the buying of Federal property is the cheaper alternative to a long-term lease.

Designed as a measure to bring free-market efficiency into Federal real estate, H.R. 2220 would save taxpayers from costly, long-term lease contracts where bargain purchases better suit the situation.

For example, the Tacoma Union Station purchase approved by the Transportation Committee earlier this year shows the benefits of allowing these bargain-price purchases. Prior to a scoring rule change, the GSA negotiated a \$1 purchase price of the facility in order to undertake necessary seismic and building system modernizations.

By purchasing the property, the GSA will be making the needed investments to modernize the facility for Federal use while realizing a lease cost avoidance of approximately \$6.4 million and protecting American taxpayer dollars.

This legislation provides a commonsense correction that will continue this committee's work in reducing the taxpayers' burden in Federal real estate.

I appreciate the chair and ranking member of the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor and my colleague and friend from Indiana, Congressman GREG PENCE, and his office's work on this issue in the previous Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2220.

As a champion of this legislation last Congress, we must continue to work toward giving the GSA the ability to negotiate a discounted or fixed price option on government leases like it happens in the private sector.

With our Nation's real infrastructure broken, which is too often ignored by this Congress, I am committed to getting a commonsense option like this one across the finish line.

H.R. 2220 will save billions of taxpayer dollars, reduce government waste, and free up money to invest in our crumbling roads and infrastructure.

Innovative, free market solutions like this bill have the potential to save \$5 billion taxpayer dollars by bringing fair market practices to Federal real estate.

Hoosiers and all Americans deserve an efficient government that can meet our 21st century infrastructure needs.

By passing this bill, we are enacting real, commonsense infrastructure legislation that has bipartisan support across the aisle.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, in closing, H.R. 2220 ensures that the GSA is able to negotiate discounted purchase options and leases to save potentially billions in taxpayer dollars.

I urge support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2220.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ODELL HORTON FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 390) to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee as the "Odell Horton Federal Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 390

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, commonly known as the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton Federal Building", shall be known and designated as the "Odell Horton Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Odell Horton Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 390.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 390 designates the Federal building at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the Odell Horton Federal Building.

The bill is sponsored by our colleague from Tennessee, Representative STEVE COHEN, and it is cosponsored by the entire Tennessee congressional delegation.

Currently, the Federal building in downtown Memphis is named for Clifford Davis, a former Congressman who was a member of the KKK, and this legislation would rename the building in honor of Judge Odell Horton, the first Black Federal judge and assistant U.S. attorney in Tennessee since Reconstruction, who was nominated by President Jimmy Carter and confirmed by the U.S. Senate in 1980.

The history of America is replete with acts of bigotry, oppression, and hatred. We can't erase it, but we can make sure we don't honor it. I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 390, which designates the Federal building located in Memphis, Tennessee, as the Odell Horton Federal Building.

Judge Odell Horton served his community with great honor and great distinction.

I thank Transportation Committee members Representatives COHEN and BURCHETT, along with members of the Tennessee delegation, for their leadership and bipartisan work on this bill.

I also know that my colleagues in the Senate are very interested in this issue, and I hope that we can work together to find a resolution that works for both Chambers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 390, which would fully name the Federal building in Memphis for Odell Horton, a great jurist. Right now, it is the Clifford Davis-Odell Horton Federal Building, and this would remove Clifford Davis' name from the Memphis Federal building.

In one of my first acts as a Congressman, the first bill I passed was a bill to add Judge Horton's name to the Federal building and to call it the Clifford Davis-Odell Horton Federal Building. I initially hoped to simply rename the building for Judge Horton, but the political will to do that was not present at that time.

Now, here we are in 2021, and the political will is present, including the family of the late Clifford Davis, who we communicated with, and they suggested that it should be renamed. The family said: "We are proud of Cliff Davis' many contributions to Memphis, but his membership in the Klan and his support for Jim Crow cannot be excused."

I completely agree and believe it is time to ensure that all of Memphis can look with pride and respect at their Federal building and have a name for this great jurist who served in that Federal building.

Judge Horton left a remarkable legacy as the first Black Federal judge appointed since Reconstruction. Judge Horton also served as chief judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee. He served as an assistant U.S. attorney, the first African-American member of Mayor Henry Loeb's city administration as the head of health and hospitals, and the president of LeMoyné-Owen College, a historic HBCU located in Memphis.

Judge Horton was a man of honor who dedicated his life to public service for the betterment of west Tennessee. Judge Horton broke down racial barriers and served the judicial system well. Judge Horton is long deserved in this individual distinction.

I thank the entire Tennessee delegation and Mr. GUEST for joining in the movement to pass this bill and honor Judge Horton in this singular manner. I also thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Chairwoman TITUS, and Ranking Members GRAVES and WEBSTER for advancing this bill to the floor.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me and vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, in closing, it is appropriate to honor Judge Horton's service to our country by naming this building after him.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative COHEN for his sponsorship of this legislation, for the bipartisan support that it enjoys.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 390.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

NORMAN YOSHIO MINETA FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4679) to designate the Federal building located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue Southeast in Washington, DC, as the "Norman Yoshio Mineta Federal Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue Southeast in Washington, DC, shall be known and designated as the "Norman Yoshio Mineta Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Norman Yoshio Mineta Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4679.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4679 names the Department of Transportation headquarters building in Washington, D.C., after our former colleague Norm Mineta. This recognition is long overdue.

Secretary Norm Mineta is a great American patriot. He, along with his family, suffered the grave injustice of being forcibly relocated and interned during World War II. But he was not bitter toward his country or his government. Instead, he spent his career serving his country by participating in and improving government.

For almost 30 years, Norm represented San Jose on the city council, then as mayor, and then from 1975 to 1995 as a Member of Congress. Norm served on the Committee on Transportation and Public Works throughout his two decades in Congress, and we served together for 7 years. Norm chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation, the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, and finally the full committee.

Norm was a primary author of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, ISTEA, which, as President George H.W. Bush said during the signing ceremony, was “the most important transportation bill since President Eisenhower started the interstate system 35 years ago.”

Norm was also a cofounder of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus and served as its first chair.

Norm’s skills and accomplishments have been widely recognized by both sides of the aisle. Norm was President Bill Clinton’s Secretary of Commerce and President George W. Bush’s Secretary of Transportation, where he was the longest-serving Secretary of Transportation in U.S. history, January 2001 until July 2006. Norm was the first person of Asian-Pacific descent to serve as Secretary of Commerce or Secretary of Transportation, and he was the first DOT Secretary to have served in a previous Cabinet position.

Following the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, Secretary Mineta worked closely with the then-chair of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Mr. Mica, and myself as ranking member to create the Transportation Security Administration.

Prior to that time, the security at airports was always provided by the lowest bidder. In fact, one of the companies was owned by previous felons. We professionalized aviation security in the TSA. That agency was 65,000 employees, the largest mobilization of a new Federal agency since World War II.

For his contributions to this institution, to our government, and to the

field of transportation, Secretary Mineta deserves this recognition.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4679 designates the U.S. Department of Transportation headquarters as the Norman Yoshio Mineta Federal Building.

Norman Mineta served as both the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and, later, as the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation. Both his work on the committee and as DOT Secretary demonstrates his commitment to public service.

Madam Speaker, I know that our colleagues in the Senate are also very interested in this issue, and I hope that we can work together to find a resolution that works for both Chambers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to again recognize Norman Mineta for his service on both the committee and the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I recommend this legislation to my colleagues for this long-overdue honor for the longest-serving Secretary of Transportation and the only one who ever served previously as Secretary in another part of the administration.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4679.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

FREDERICK P. STAMP, JR. FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4660) to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 1125 Chapline Street in Wheeling, West Virginia, as the “Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4660

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1125 Chapline Street in Wheeling, West Virginia, shall be known and designated as the “Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal building and United States Courthouse”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal Building and United States Courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4660.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4660 designates the Federal Building located at 1125 Chapline Street in Wheeling, West Virginia as the Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and Courthouse. This legislation was introduced by Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY of West Virginia. Congressman MCKINLEY has long sought this designation to honor Judge Stamp’s career and legacy.

Frederick P. Stamp Jr. was born in Wheeling, West Virginia, received a bachelor of arts degree from Washington and Lee University, and a law degree from the University of Virginia. He was a private in the United States Army from 1959 to 1960, and a first lieutenant in the Army Reserves from 1960 to 1967. After 30 years in private practice in Wheeling, from 1960 to 1990, he was nominated by President George H.W. Bush to a seat on the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, where he served as chief judge from 1994 to 2001.

Judge Stamp’s service to his community, his State, our Nation, and the judicial system is widely respected. I strongly support H.R. 4660, as an overdue recognition of his service, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4660, which designates the Federal

Building and U.S. Courthouse located in Wheeling, West Virginia, as the Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse in honor of Judge Frederick Stamp.

I thank my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, for his leadership on this bill. I know that our colleagues in the Senate are very interested in this issue, and we want to work together with them so we can resolve this. I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his support on this, as well as the ranking member on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an individual who represents the very best of West Virginia and recognize him as one of our country's most respected and thoughtful jurists, the Honorable Frederick P. Stamp, Jr.

Judge Stamp began his tenure as a Federal judge when he was confirmed in 1990 to the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, where he would preside as chief judge.

In West Virginia, Judge Stamp is known for his commitment to service above self. This is evident from his military service, his time spent in the West Virginia legislature, his work as a private attorney, and for his support of countless community organizations. He has been a steadfast and respected pillar of West Virginia, living there his entire life.

Having raised two adult children, Judge Stamp and his wife, Joan, are valued members of the Wheeling community. And Judge Stamp has already been honored by his selection to the Wheeling Hall of Fame.

Humble to the extreme, but humble by nature, it is a testament to his character that Judge Stamp would never personally seek this type of recognition. But he has earned it and his peers would like to see that recognition for him.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud that Congress is taking this opportunity to honor such a great American by naming the building in which Judge Stamp has spent the majority of his professional service and public life, the Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Courthouse in Wheeling, West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution and I thank the chairman for his support.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think it is appropriate to recognize Judge Stamp's

service to our country by naming this Federal building after him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a long overdue honor for Judge Stamp. And as the gentleman from West Virginia said, he would never have sought this honor himself, but it is being done by Congress in recognition of his great service to our Nation and the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4660.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

REINFORCING NICARAGUA'S ADHERENCE TO CONDITIONS FOR ELECTORAL REFORM ACT OF 2021

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1064) to advance the strategic alignment of United States diplomatic tools toward the realization of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua and to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to protect the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of Nicaragua, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Reinforcing Nicaragua’s Adherence to Conditions for Electoral Reform Act of 2021” or the “RENACER Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 3. Review of participation of Nicaragua in Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement.

Sec. 4. Restrictions on international financial institutions relating to Nicaragua.

Sec. 5. Targeted sanctions to advance democratic elections.

Sec. 6. Developing and implementing a coordinated sanctions strategy with diplomatic partners.

Sec. 7. Inclusion of Nicaragua in list of countries subject to certain sanctions relating to corruption.

Sec. 8. Classified report on the involvement of Ortega family members and Nicaraguan government officials in corruption.

Sec. 9. Classified report on the activities of the Russian Federation in Nicaragua.

Sec. 10. Report on certain purchases by and agreements entered into by Government of Nicaragua relating to military or intelligence sector of Nicaragua.

Sec. 11. Report on human rights abuses in Nicaragua.

Sec. 12. Supporting independent news media and freedom of information in Nicaragua.

Sec. 13. Amendment to short title of Public Law 115-335.

Sec. 14. Definition.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) ongoing efforts by the government of President Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua to suppress the voice and actions of political opponents through intimidation and unlawful detainment, civil society, and independent news media violate the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of Nicaragua;

(2) Congress unequivocally condemns the politically motivated and unlawful detention of presidential candidates Cristiana Chamorro, Arturo Cruz, Felix Maradiaga, and Juan Sebastian Chamorro;

(3) Congress unequivocally condemns the passage of the Foreign Agents Regulation Law, the Special Cybercrimes Law, the Self-Determination Law, and the Consumer Protection Law by the National Assembly of Nicaragua, which represent clear attempts by the Ortega government to curtail the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of Nicaragua;

(4) Congress recognizes that free, fair, and transparent elections predicated on robust reform measures and the presence of domestic and international observers represent the best opportunity for the people of Nicaragua to restore democracy and reach a peaceful solution to the political and social crisis in Nicaragua;

(5) the United States recognizes the right of the people of Nicaragua to freely determine their own political future as vital to ensuring the sustainable restoration of democracy in their country;

(6) the United States should align the use of diplomatic engagement and all other foreign policy tools, including the use of targeted sanctions, in support of efforts by democratic political actors and civil society in Nicaragua to advance the necessary conditions for free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua;

(7) the United States, in order to maximize the effectiveness of efforts described in paragraph (6), should—

(A) coordinate with diplomatic partners, including the Government of Canada, the European Union, and partners in Latin America and the Caribbean;

(B) advance diplomatic initiatives in consultation with the Organization of American States and the United Nations; and

(C) thoroughly investigate the assets and holdings of the Nicaraguan Armed Forces in the United States and consider appropriate actions to hold such forces accountable for gross violations of human rights; and

(8) pursuant to section 6(b) of the Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act of 2018, the President should waive the application of restrictions under section 4 of that Act and the sanctions under section 5 of that Act if the Secretary of State certifies that the Government of Nicaragua is taking the steps

identified in section 6(a) of that Act, including taking steps to “to hold free and fair elections overseen by credible domestic and international observers”.

SEC. 3. REVIEW OF PARTICIPATION OF NICARAGUA IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On November 27, 2018, the President signed Executive Order 13851 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Nicaragua), which stated that “the situation in Nicaragua, including the violent response by the Government of Nicaragua to the protests that began on April 18, 2018, and the Ortega regime’s systematic dismantling and undermining of democratic institutions and the rule of law, its use of indiscriminate violence and repressive tactics against civilians, as well as its corruption leading to the destabilization of Nicaragua’s economy, constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States”.

(2) Article 21.2 of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement approved by Congress under section 101(a)(1) of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 4011(a)(1)) states, “Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed . . . to preclude a Party from applying measures that it considers necessary for the fulfillment of its obligations with respect to the maintenance or restoration of international peace or security, or the protection of its own essential security interests.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should review the continued participation of Nicaragua in the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement if the Government of Nicaragua continues to tighten its authoritarian rule in an attempt to subvert democratic elections in November 2021 and undermine democracy and human rights in Nicaragua.

SEC. 4. RESTRICTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS RELATING TO NICARAGUA.

Section 4 of the Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act of 2018 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively;

(2) by inserting before subsection (b), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

“(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury should take all possible steps, including through the full implementation of the exceptions set forth in subsection (c), to ensure that the restrictions required under subsection (b) do not negatively impact the basic human needs of the people of Nicaragua.”;

(3) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(4) by striking subsection (d), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

“(d) INCREASED OVERSIGHT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Executive Director at each international financial institution of the World Bank Group, the United States Executive Director at the Inter-American Development Bank, and the United States Executive Director at each other international financial institution, including the International Monetary Fund, shall take all practicable steps—

“(A) to increase scrutiny of any loan or financial or technical assistance provided for a project in Nicaragua; and

“(B) to ensure that the loan or assistance is administered through an entity with full technical, administrative, and financial independence from the Government of Nicaragua.”.

“(2) MECHANISMS FOR INCREASED SCRUTINY.—The United States Executive Director at each international financial institution described in paragraph (1) shall use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to encourage that institution to increase oversight mechanisms for new and existing loans or financial or technical assistance provided for a project in Nicaragua.

“(e) INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION.—Before implementing the restrictions described in subsection (b), or before exercising an exception under subsection (c), the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the Secretary of State and with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to ensure that all loans and financial or technical assistance to Nicaragua are consistent with United States foreign policy objectives as defined in section 3.

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the RENACER Act, and annually thereafter until the termination date specified in section 10, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this section, which shall include—

“(1) summary of any loans and financial and technical assistance provided by international financial institutions for projects in Nicaragua;

“(2) a description of the implementation of the restrictions described in subsection (b);

“(3) an identification of the occasions in which the exceptions under subsection (c) are exercised and an assessment of how the loan or assistance provided with each such exception may address basic human needs or promote democracy in Nicaragua;

“(4) a description of the results of the increased oversight conducted under subsection (d); and

“(5) a description of international efforts to address the humanitarian needs of the people of Nicaragua.”.

SEC. 5. TARGETED SANCTIONS TO ADVANCE DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS.

(a) COORDINATED STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), shall develop and implement a coordinated strategy to align diplomatic engagement efforts with the implementation of targeted sanctions in order to support efforts to facilitate the necessary conditions for free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua.

(2) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until December 31, 2022, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on steps to be taken by the United States Government to develop and implement the coordinated strategy required by paragraph (1).

(b) TARGETED SANCTIONS PRIORITIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the coordinated strategy required by subsection (a), the President shall prioritize the implementation of the targeted sanctions required under section 5 of the Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act of 2018.

(2) TARGETS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the President—

(A) shall examine whether foreign persons involved in directly or indirectly obstructing the establishment of conditions necessary for the realization of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua are subject to sanctions under section 5 of the Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act of 2018; and

(B) should, in particular, examine whether the following persons have engaged in conduct subject to such sanctions:

(i) Officials in the government of President Daniel Ortega.

(ii) Family members of President Daniel Ortega.

(iii) High-ranking members of the National Nicaraguan Police.

(iv) High-ranking members of the Nicaraguan Armed Forces.

(v) Members of the Supreme Electoral Council of Nicaragua.

(vi) Officials of the Central Bank of Nicaragua.

(vii) Party members and elected officials from the Sandinista National Liberation Front and their family members.

(viii) Individuals or entities affiliated with businesses engaged in corrupt financial transactions with officials in the government of President Daniel Ortega, his party, or his family.

(ix) Individuals identified in the report required by section 8 as involved in significant acts of public corruption in Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A COORDINATED SANCTIONS STRATEGY WITH DIPLOMATIC PARTNERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On June 21, 2019, the Government of Canada, pursuant to its Special Economic Measures Act, designated 9 officials of the Government of Nicaragua for the imposition of sanctions in response to gross and systematic human rights violations in Nicaragua.

(2) On May 4, 2020, the European Union imposed sanctions with respect to 6 officials of the Government of Nicaragua identified as responsible for serious human rights violations and for the repression of civil society and democratic opposition in Nicaragua.

(3) On October 12, 2020, the European Union extended its authority to impose restrictive measures on “persons and entities responsible for serious human rights violations or abuses or for the repression of civil society and democratic opposition in Nicaragua, as well as persons and entities whose actions, policies or activities otherwise undermine democracy and the rule of law in Nicaragua, and persons associated with them”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should encourage the Government of Canada, the European Union and governments of members countries of the European Union, and governments of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean to use targeted sanctions with respect to persons involved in human rights violations and the obstruction of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua.

(c) COORDINATING INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS.—The Secretary of State, working through the head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination established by section 1(h) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(h)), and in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall engage in diplomatic efforts with governments of countries that are partners of the United States, including the Government of Canada, governments of countries in the European Union, and governments of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, to impose targeted sanctions with respect to the persons described in section 5(b) in order to advance democratic elections in Nicaragua.

(d) **BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until December 31, 2022, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the implementation of this section.

SEC. 7. INCLUSION OF NICARAGUA IN LIST OF COUNTRIES SUBJECT TO CERTAIN SANCTIONS RELATING TO CORRUPTION.

Section 353 of title III of division FF of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**AND HONDURAS**” and inserting “, **HONDURAS, AND NICARAGUA**”; and

(2) by striking “and Honduras” each place it appears and inserting “, Honduras, and Nicaragua”.

SEC. 8. CLASSIFIED REPORT ON THE INVOLVEMENT OF ORTEGA FAMILY MEMBERS AND NICARAGUAN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN CORRUPTION.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, acting through the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit a classified report to the appropriate congressional committees on significant acts of public corruption in Nicaragua that—

(1) involve—

(A) the President of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega;

(B) members of the family of Daniel Ortega; and

(C) senior officials of the Ortega government, including—

(i) members of the Supreme Electoral Council, the Nicaraguan Armed Forces, and the National Nicaraguan Police; and

(ii) elected officials from the Sandinista National Liberation Front party;

(2) pose challenges for United States national security and regional stability;

(3) impede the realization of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua; and

(4) violate the fundamental freedoms of civil society and political opponents in Nicaragua.

(b) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. CLASSIFIED REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN NICARAGUA.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, acting through the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit a classified report to the appropriate congressional committees on activities of the Government of the Russian Federation in Nicaragua, including—

(1) cooperation between Russian and Nicaraguan military personnel, intelligence services, security forces, and law enforcement, and private Russian security contractors;

(2) cooperation related to telecommunications and satellite navigation;

(3) other political and economic cooperation, including with respect to banking, disinformation, and election interference; and

(4) the threats and risks that such activities pose to United States national interests and national security.

(b) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10. REPORT ON CERTAIN PURCHASES BY AND AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY GOVERNMENT OF NICARAGUA RELATING TO MILITARY OR INTELLIGENCE SECTOR OF NICARAGUA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, acting through the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) a list of—

(A) all equipment, technology, or infrastructure with respect to the military or intelligence sector of Nicaragua purchased, on or after January 1, 2011, by the Government of Nicaragua from an entity identified by the Department of State under section 231(e) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9525(e)); and

(B) all agreements with respect to the military or intelligence sector of Nicaragua entered into, on or after January 1, 2011, by the Government of Nicaragua with an entity described in subparagraph (A); and

(2) a description of and date for each purchase and agreement described in paragraph (1).

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be prepared after consideration of the content of the report of the Defense Intelligence Agency entitled, “Russia: Defense Cooperation with Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela” and dated February 4, 2019.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 11. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN NICARAGUA.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that, since the June 2018 initiation of “Operation Clean-up”, an effort of the government of Daniel Ortega to dismantle barricades constructed throughout Nicaragua during social demonstrations in April 2018, the Ortega government has increased its abuse of campesinos and members of indigenous communities, including arbitrary detentions, torture, and sexual violence as a form of intimidation.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that documents the perpetration of gross human rights violations by the Ortega government against the citizens of Nicaragua, including campesinos and indigenous communities in the interior of Nicaragua.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (b) shall—

(1) include a compilation of human rights violations committed by the Ortega government against the citizens of Nicaragua, with a focus on such violations committed since April 2018, including human rights abuses and extrajudicial killings in—

(A) the cities of Managua, Carazo, and Masaya between April and June of 2018; and

(B) the municipalities of Wiwili, El Cuá, San Jose de Bocay, and Santa Maria de Pantasma in the Department of Jinotega, Esquipulas in the Department of Rivas, and Bilwi in the North Caribbean Coast Autonomous Region between 2018 and 2021;

(2) outline efforts by the Ortega government to intimidate and disrupt the activities of civil society organizations attempting to hold the government accountable for infringing on the fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Nicaragua; and

(3) provide recommendations on how the United States, in collaboration with international partners and Nicaraguan civil society, should leverage bilateral and regional relationships to curtail the gross human rights violations perpetrated by the Ortega government and better support the victims of human rights violations in Nicaragua.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 12. SUPPORTING INDEPENDENT NEWS MEDIA AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION IN NICARAGUA.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, and the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an evaluation of the governmental, political, and technological obstacles faced by the people of Nicaragua in their efforts to obtain accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information about domestic and international affairs; and

(2) a list of all TV channels, radio stations, online news sites, and other media platforms operating in Nicaragua that are directly or indirectly owned or controlled by President Daniel Ortega, members of the Ortega family, or known allies of the Ortega government.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the extent to which the current level and type of news and related programming and content provided by the Voice of America and other sources is addressing the informational needs of the people of Nicaragua;

(2) a description of existing United States efforts to strengthen freedom of the press and freedom of expression in Nicaragua, including recommendations to expand upon those efforts; and

(3) a strategy for strengthening independent broadcasting, information distribution, and media platforms in Nicaragua.

SEC. 13. AMENDMENT TO SHORT TITLE OF PUBLIC LAW 115-335.

Section 1(a) of the Nicaragua Human Rights and Anticorruption Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-335; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the ‘Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act of 2018’ or the ‘NICA Act’.”.

SEC. 14. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term “Nicaragua Investment Conditionality Act of 2018” means the Public Law 115-335 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by section 13.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1064.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1064, the RENACER Act.

I thank my good friend, ALBIO SIREs from New Jersey, for his tireless work in championing this bill and continuously drawing attention to the anti-democratic actions taken by the Ortega regime.

This legislation makes clear that the United States will not sit by quietly as another country in our hemisphere slides further away from our democratic values. Working with our friends and partners in the international community, this bill will allow us to continue applying pressure on the Ortega regime ahead of the elections later this month. Sadly, all signs indicate that these elections will be far from free and fair.

Passing this bill will demonstrate the United States Government's strong belief that a commitment to upholding human rights and free expression are key pillars of promoting and preserving democracy.

The legislation takes a number of important steps. It restricts the Ortega regime's ability to access capital for corrupt purposes via international financial institutions and will bolster transparency mechanisms to ensure any that funds Nicaragua receives are not siphoned off for illicit or illegal purposes.

The RENACER Act will also ensure our sanctions policy is thoughtful and effective by focusing targeted sanctions on bad actors undermining the rule of law and democracy and not on the Nicaraguan people.

Crucially, the legislation requires the Secretary of State to work with partners to make our sanctions multilateral and even more effective.

The RENACER Act also serves a crucial factfinding purpose by including important reports on regime corruption, human rights abuses, arms sales, and Russia's role in the country. Just as this bill builds on the Nicaragua Human Rights and Anticorruption Act of 2018, these report provisions will help Congress develop and mold additional responses should the Ortega regime continue down an illiberal and undemocratic path.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, November 2, 2021.

Hon. GREGORY MEEKS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning S. 1064, Reinforcing Nicaragua's Adherence to Conditions for Electoral Reform (RENACER) Act of 2021. In order to permit S. 1064 to proceed expeditiously to the House Floor, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action to forego formal consideration of S. 1064 in light of our mutual understanding that, by foregoing formal consideration of S. 1064 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward with regard to any matters in the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation that involves the Committee's jurisdiction and request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of S. 1064.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, November 2, 2021.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: I am writing to you concerning S. 1064, Reinforcing Nicaragua's Adherence to Conditions for Electoral Reform (RENACER) Act of 2021. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on S. 1064 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I also acknowledge that your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward, and will support the appointment of Committee on Financial Services conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

GREGORY W. MEEKS,
Chairman.

□ 1415

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, the RENACER Act, that seeks to address the Ortega regime's

dismantling of Nicaragua's democracy, and seeks to support freedom-loving Nicaraguan's democratic aspirations.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation should have been passed months ago when Congress had an opportunity to stop Ortega's campaign of terror.

The world has watched in horror as Nicaragua, under Daniel Ortega's authoritarian rule, has brutally consolidated into one-party dictatorship. Joining the governments in Cuba and Venezuela, Ortega's Nicaragua is now Latin America's third socialist regime.

On November 7, this coming Sunday, Nicaragua will hold a political farce claiming to resemble elections. Meanwhile, Daniel Ortega holds opposition candidates and over 140 political prisoners unlawfully incarcerated. This includes people like opposition student leader Lesther Aleman, a 23-year-old who cannot even walk due to the brutality he has endured while illegally detained; or the husbands of Victoria Cardenas and Berta Valle. They were leading presidential candidates who planned to oppose Ortega in the next election, but found themselves imprisoned in inhumane conditions and deprived of due process.

I have met with these brave women and I admire their courage and advocacy for all of Nicaragua's unjustly detained.

I am a lead cosponsor of this bill, and I am grateful for the leadership of Congresswoman MARIA SALAZAR, and to the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, ALBIO SIREs, for his advocacy of the plight of Nicaragua's political prisoners. I greatly appreciate his friendship and his leadership.

This bipartisan bill will require targeted sanctions against corrupt regime officials who have dismantled Nicaragua's democracy and undermined these elections. It will also ensure the United States is coordinating targeted sanctions with our Canadian and European Union allies.

This legislation also expands oversight to ensure international financing institutions are not enriching the corrupt regime while making sure there are humanitarian exceptions. It requires a classified report on Russia's nefarious activities in Nicaragua, whose intelligence and security cooperation has dramatically expanded.

The United States must condemn the electoral charade taking place on Sunday and urge our international partners to join us. America must continue to be the beacon of freedom and stand against authoritarian socialist leaders. We must hold the Ortega regime accountable for its atrocious and destabilizing behavior.

We only need to look at Venezuela to see the consequences of ignoring rising socialist authoritarianism. More can and should be done, and a positive first step is passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in this effort. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR).

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1064, the RENACER Act. I am proud to have introduced this bill with Congressman ALBIO SIREs, Senator BOB MENENDEZ, and Senator MARCO RUBIO.

For years, dictator Daniel Ortega has been quietly dismantling democracy in Nicaragua. First, he ripped the constitution apart to get reelected, then he seized control of every branch of government, of the military, and of the police.

Ortega wants to rule the country from an iron throne, and the Nicaraguan people are suffering as a result. Ortega has banned political parties, and he has killed hundreds of Nicaraguans and jailed hundreds more.

Now we are on the eve of one of his most brazen moves in nearly 35 years of terrorizing this country, a sham election where all seven presidential candidates were arrested in broad daylight; one of them being my ex-husband, Arturo Cruz. This is his most flagrant example of a stolen election as we have ever seen, and the world needs to know that.

His brutal regime must be held accountable for its crimes against humanity and for its systematic attack on democracy. That is why Congress must pass the RENACER Act now. RENACER increases sanctions on Ortega and on Ortega's chief co-conspirator and vice-president, his wife, Rosario Murillo; and on the Nicaraguan security forces that brutalized their people.

It brings the international communities together to take down Ortega's safe havens around the world, and it exposes the Russian meddling in that country. The RENACER Act sends a clear message to Ortega and Murillo that your time is up.

I am also pleased that the provisions from my Nicaragua Free Trade Review Act were included in this critical legislation. This will trigger a review of Nicaragua's participation in the Central American Free Trade Agreement, CAFTA. The CAFTA-DR trade agreement gives Nicaragua open access to United States markets. To trade with the United States is a privilege, it is not a right.

I am here to tell Ortega and Murillo, you murderous dictators, you treacherous thugs, you will no longer have a free pass to enrich yourselves. Tyrants around the world are watching. Passing the RENACER Act shows the consequences of jailing your political opponents, of oppressing your people, and of stealing elections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with those who have been beaten and detained. I urge my colleagues to stand with the Nicaraguan people. I urge my colleagues to take a stand against tyranny.

The United States has long been the torch-bearer for democracy around the world. We must continue to carry that torch.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the RENACER Act, S. 1064, which seeks to hold the regime of Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua accountable for its ongoing violations of human rights and subversion of the rule of law and democracy in that country.

I am a proud cosponsor of the companion bill in the House, introduced by my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, ALBIO SIREs, and I must say that today's vote could not be more timely.

For this Sunday, November 7, the Ortega regime will hold sham elections where those who would have legitimately challenged strongman Daniel Ortega are either in exile or in prison.

Among those who have been arrested are Cristina Chamorro Barrios, Juan Sebastian Chamorro, Arturo Cruz Jr., Medardo Mairena, Felix Maradiaga, Miguel Mora and Noel Vidaurre.

This past July I convened a hearing as co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission entitled "The Ortega Government and the Human Cost of Repression in Nicaragua."

Among those who testified at the hearing were the wives of two of the arrested would-be candidates: Felix Maradiaga's wife Berta Valles, and Juan Sebastian Chamorro's wife Victoria Cardenas.

These brave women gave voice to their husbands' courage, and spoke on their behalf because they could not.

They recounted to us the repression unleashed by Daniel Ortega and his wife Rosario Murillo, who is running for Vice President.

Berta Valles recounted to us that "For years, Felix has been a target of attacks by the Ortega regime because he speaks truth to power. He has been beaten, confined to house arrest, and threatened. For months, he endured 24/7 surveillance by the police. They have tried again and again to silence him, but he never stands down."

Likewise, Victoria Cardenas also told us that because her husband, Juan Sebastian Chamorro, dared to speak out against Ortega's oppression, "the regime has also persecuted and harassed me and my family. They have brought a civil case against me, my sister, and my mother, which would take away all my mother's assets. They have brought a criminal case against me, and there is an open warrant for my arrest. It is clear that Ortega is using every part of Nicaragua's institutions, including its judicial system, to not only persecute those who challenge the government, but also their family members."

Ladies and Gentlemen, we must counter this regime of repression.

It should be clear to all that this Sunday's election, with opposition leaders in prison or in exile, is a sham.

I urge all of you to support the RENACER Act, which among other things would apply targeted sanctions to advance democracy, coordinate with our diplomatic partners to implement a sanctions strategy and commit the United States further in support of an independent news media in Nicaragua.

All who oppose the Ortega regime in Nicaragua—be they from the Democratic Left or the Political Right—stand united against tyranny.

Likewise, we too are unified, Republicans and Democrats, in opposing Ortega's tyranny. I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan RENACER Act, and stand with the people of Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the RENACER Act.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would once again like to thank my good friends, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SIREs, and Ms. SALAZAR for leading this measure. I am proud to join my colleagues in this effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, RENACER is an excellent piece of legislation. I thank my colleagues who, in a bipartisan way, worked together under Representative SIREs' tireless leadership, and for his work with Senator MENENDEZ in getting this bill across the finish line.

The United States must stand for democracy. We must stand for democracy in Nicaragua. This legislation shows that we will not abdicate our responsibility to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1064.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH CUBAN CITIZENS FOR FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 760) expressing solidarity with Cuban citizens demonstrating peacefully for fundamental freedoms, condemning the Cuban regime's acts of repression, and calling for the immediate release of arbitrarily detained Cuban citizens.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 760

Whereas, on July 11, 2021, thousands of Cubans took to the streets to express their dissatisfaction with Cuba's continued repression of its people, its worsening economic situation, and shortages of food and medicine;

Whereas these demonstrations were the largest protests on the island in over 25 years, with courageous Cuban men, women,

and youth taking to the streets in cities and towns across the country;

Whereas the Cuban regime arbitrarily denied a request to allow a peaceful demonstration on November 15, 2021, which the organizers have specified would be “against violence, to demand that all the rights of all Cubans be respected, for the release of political prisoners and for the solution of our differences through democratic and peaceful means”;

Whereas the Cuban regime also denied an earlier request for protests to be held on November 20, 2021, stating that date was off-limits because it would conflict with “national defense day” and claiming without evidence that “subversive organizations” with links to the United States Government were promoting the protest;

Whereas artists, academics, activists, and journalists have been long engaged in ongoing protests calling for an end to Cuba’s persecution, censorship, arbitrary detention, and other human rights violations;

Whereas expanded internet access is foundational for the Cuban people to be able to exercise their internationally recognized human rights of access to information and freedom of expression, creating opportunities for Cubans to communicate more openly with one another and for their voices to be heard around the world;

Whereas numerous public reports and firsthand accounts revealed that the Cuban regime deliberately blocked access to certain websites and messaging apps, throttled internet access, and launched targeted attacks to disrupt the internet connections of private Cuban citizens;

Whereas during the July protests, regime security officials physically assaulted domestic and international journalists, including Associated Press correspondent Ramon Espinosa, and prevented dozens of reporters from leaving their homes to report on the protests, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists;

Whereas Cuba is among the most restrictive countries in the world for journalists, ranked 171 of 180 countries in Reporters Without Borders’ 2021 World Press Freedom Index;

Whereas Cuban human rights groups report there were already at least 150 political prisoners in Cuba before the July 11 protests, and Cuba has reportedly been responsible for over 400 additional arrests or forced disappearances since then;

Whereas hundreds of Cubans who participated in the July protests continue to face unjust detention and other forms of retribution, including dozens who have been sentenced in summary trials without due process and dozens of others who remain unaccounted for;

Whereas United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet expressed concern about “the excessive force against demonstrators in Cuba and the arrest of a large number of people, including journalists” and noted “it is particularly worrying that these include individuals allegedly held incommunicado and people whose whereabouts are unknown”;

Whereas, on July 25, 2021, Secretary of State Antony Blinken and the foreign ministers of 20 countries issued a statement to “condemn the mass arrests and detentions of protestors in Cuba and call on the government to respect the universal rights and freedoms of the Cuban people, including the free flow of information to all Cubans”;

Whereas, on October 17, 2021, Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs Brian A. Nichols said “Denying the right of peaceful assembly to Cubans this November 15th shows the Cuban regime’s disregard for the human rights and freedoms of

its people. This and other blatant attempts to intimidate their citizens is a clear sign the regime won’t listen to what Cubans have to say.”;

Whereas over the summer, Cuba has seen record numbers of COVID-19 infections and deaths, pushing hospitals and health centers to near collapse; and

Whereas basic medicines and common goods have become scarce throughout the country and economists estimate Cuba’s economic conditions will become even worse in the coming months: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses strong solidarity with the Cuban people who took to the streets throughout the country on July 11, 2021, and with those who plan to peacefully demonstrate on November 15, 2021, to once again express their desire to live in a free country with self-determination;

(2) condemns the Cuban regime’s violent repression of peaceful protesters and journalists and its other efforts to restrict the Cuban people’s right to peacefully protest, freely express themselves, and exercise their other universal human rights;

(3) calls on Cuba to end all efforts to block or throttle the Cuban people’s internet access or restrict their access to certain websites or applications and to permit them to freely communicate online, including during future demonstrations and peaceful protests;

(4) calls on members of the Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces, the Cuban Ministry of the Interior, and Cuba’s National Revolutionary Police Force to not arrest or detain peaceful protesters, provide due process to all individuals, and immediately release all political prisoners and arbitrarily detained individuals still in their custody; and

(5) urges the Biden administration to—

(A) work with Cuban activists, civil society groups, private United States companies, and the international community to expand internet access for the Cuban people;

(B) support the Cuban people’s inherent right to demonstrate peacefully in the name of democracy and human rights;

(C) continue to stand behind the aspirations of the Cuban people for freedom, for dignity, for prosperity, and the basic rights that they have been denied by the regime since 1959;

(D) assess whether the United States can develop methods to allow remittances, medical supplies, and other forms of support from the United States to directly benefit the Cuban people in ways that alleviate humanitarian suffering without providing United States dollars to the Cuban military; and

(E) rally the international community to join the United States in condemning human rights abuses and honoring the Cuban people’s demands for freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 760.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 760, introduced by my friend and colleague, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, together with my friend, Congressman DIAZ-BALART, and chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Congressman SIRES, supports the basic human rights of the Cuban people and stands with them in their right to peacefully protest their own government.

In July, the largest protest in decades swept the island of Cuba. Activists, in turn, were beaten and jailed by the government. Many remain jailed. According to Human Rights Watch, many have been subjected to abuse and torture simply for standing up for access to food, to medicine, to information, and to have their rights respected.

This resolution expresses solidarity with the Cuban people ahead of planned nationwide protests for November 15. The organizers of these protests sought approval from the government, as the Cuban constitution allows for legitimate protest. They were denied.

We must stand with the people of Cuba as they exercise their right to free expression. We must condemn the violent response to peaceful protests by the Cuban people. That is what this resolution does.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for working to bring this resolution to the floor, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution expressing solidarity with the freedom-loving Cuban citizens, condemning the regime’s violence against innocent protesters, and calling on our international partners to pledge support for Cuban freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleagues, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, and ALBIO SIRES for their work on this resolution.

For over 60 years, Cubans have been held hostage by a tyrannical dictatorship. The Communists have bankrupted a beautiful country, condemning three generations to misery, and separating countless families.

Castro’s Cuba is also a threat to regional stability and security, trafficking weapons to North Korea, proping up Venezuela’s cruel regime, and forging alliances with pariahs like Russia and China.

The Cuban regime is a cancer that has metastasized throughout Latin America. Starting on July 11, tens of thousands of protestors across the island demanded and pleaded for an end to the oppressive regime. Some were even waving the greatest symbol of liberty known to mankind, the American flag.

Since the protests began, Ranking Member MCCAUL has called on the majority to consider a resolution standing

in solidarity with the Cuban people; each time it was blocked. I am pleased that the leadership has finally allowed a measure to be considered 4 months after the initial protests.

Meanwhile, the Senate unanimously passed a bipartisan resolution reinforcing Congress' support for the pro-democracy movement in Cuba. As Members of Congress and Americans, we have a moral obligation to support them.

The United States remains committed to democracy and respect for human rights in the Western Hemisphere, and this resolution urges the international community to join us in these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and advocate for many Cubans who cannot speak for themselves. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and I thank him for his support. I want to thank the chairman of the committee as well for his agreeing to have this come to the floor, and I look forward to his support.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to a lot of Members about this. The policies that we have regarding Cuba are subject to debate and subject to differences. While I think, Mr. Speaker, there are no differences—there are—in this Congress, that we are all for supporting those who seek democracy and who seek the benefits of freedom and who seek the welfare of their families associated with that freedom. I don't think there is a single Member who wasn't appalled by the way peaceful protesters in Cuba were brutally suppressed in July.

□ 1430

I doubt there is anyone here who is not concerned that such actions will be repeated this month when the next protests are scheduled to occur. So this is a very timely resolution because it anticipates that there will be another group of people who will have the courage to stand up and to speak up on behalf of freedom in their country.

There was a resolution passed by the United States Senate on August 3, 2021, although it doesn't exactly mirror our resolution. Frankly, our resolution is somewhat less specific in terms of criticism and in terms of policy.

Why? Because we wanted this to be about human rights. We wanted it to be about people who stand up for freedom. We wanted it to be another statement of the thousands that we have made in countries throughout this globe that suppress the rights of people and that imprison people because they try to express their views. But this resolution that was passed in the Senate was sponsored by my counterpart, the majority whip, Mr. DURBIN; by Mr.

KAINE from Virginia; Mr. SCHATZ from Hawaii; Mr. COONS from Delaware; Mr. BOOKER from New Jersey; Ms. CORTEZ MASTO from Nevada; Mr. BROWN from Ohio; Mr. PADILLA from California; Mr. WARNER from Virginia; Mr. CARDIN from my own State of Maryland; Ms. ROSEN from Nevada; Mr. WARNOCK from Georgia; Mr. LUJÁN from New Mexico, our former chair of the campaign committee; and Ms. HASSAN from New Hampshire; along with many Republicans. My point is that this was a unanimous consent, so everybody was for it.

The vote we take on this resolution is a simple one. The text of the resolution is clear. It states that this House—all of us—stands in solidarity with Cubans seeking to express themselves and seek a redress of grievances from their leaders. It affirms that the Cuban people ought to be able to enjoy the same access to information and the internet as Americans and other free people do around the world. And it urges the Biden administration to find ways to promote freedom, human rights, and access to basic needs in Cuba.

I believe that these are goals we can support overwhelmingly. I understand that some Members believe that the text of this resolution does not include items on policy that they would like to have. I certainly think that is a legitimate concern, and there is no reason why we cannot have resolutions that speak to that. But this is singularly focused on the rights of people.

John Kennedy said that we will bear any burden to defend any peoples who essentially seek freedom. That is what this resolution does. It is simple and straightforward.

I have supported many of these policies as chairman of the Commission on Human Rights and the Helsinki Commission, where resolution after resolution said to Soviet satellites that the Helsinki signature of the Russians on that document demanded that they observe the human rights of those folks. This is a similar resolution.

I hope all Members would share my view that a strong, bipartisan, and united vote by this House will send a message to the people of Cuba that they are not alone, that the American people stand with those who speak out in peaceful protest, and that Democrats and Republicans stand together and in support of the freedoms they seek.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. I hope that the valid concerns and differences Members have on both sides of the aisle when it comes to Cuba will not preclude us from agreeing that we ought to stand in solidarity with those who are seeking the same rights that we enjoy in this extraordinary country in which we live. That is why I will be voting an enthusiastic and strong "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, to Ranking Member GREEN, also to my friend also from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) in particular, and to my good friend Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of July, the Cuban people went to the streets demanding one thing: freedom after 62 years of repression. That was 4 months ago. Many of those who hit the streets were arrested, and many of those remain in prison in the worst possible conditions. Several have held hunger strikes to protest their unjust and cruel imprisonment.

Unfortunately, there has been very little solidarity from the Biden administration. The administration has yet to even use technology available to the United States Government and even the private sector to provide internet so the Cuban people can communicate. The administration has failed to even support adequate funding for broadcasting into Cuba through the Office of Cuba Broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the administration will use remittances or even humanitarian aid or other ways to prop up the regime. Having said that, that is why I am so grateful to Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who has not given up and who has not stopped working to try to bring a resolution to the floor.

This resolution is a compromise. It is a compromise resolution, and although, as you have heard before, Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and I would have liked a stronger resolution such as the one that I introduced in July, which, again, the House leadership has refused to bring forward, this resolution does express solidarity with the Cuban people. Again, that is why I am so grateful to Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

I mention her, but I also need to mention Congressman MCCARTHY; ALBIO SIREs; MARIA ELVIRA SALAZAR; CARLOS GIMENEZ; Mr. MARK GREEN, whom I mentioned; MICHAEL MCCAUL; and TED DEUTCH for their solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution for the cause of freedom and human rights in Cuba so that the Cuban people know that they are not alone and that we are with them.

Again, while we would like to be stronger, I am grateful for those who have worked day in and day out to finally bring this forward.

Patria y vida. Cuba will be free. They must know, and they will know, that they are not alone.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 760 and in solidarity with the Cubans who, have over the past months, turned out in large numbers to engage in peaceful demonstrations for a better future.

They did so with the full knowledge that they were braving an authoritarian regime that criminalizes dissent.

According to Amnesty International's Americas director: "In response to the protests of 11 July, the Cuban authorities have applied the same machinery of control that they have used to target alternative thinkers for decades, but now amped up to a scale we haven't seen in almost 20 years, and with new tactics, including the use of internet interruptions and online censorship to control and cover up the grave human rights violations they have committed."

These are sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, husbands and wives. Above all, they are human beings who are entitled to fundamental rights denied to them for far too long.

As the House of Representatives takes this vote, let us stand with every prisoner of conscience and dissident facing persecution in Cuba and in every corner of the world.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR).

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GREEN.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 760. I want to thank my colleagues, MARIO DIAZ-BALART and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for sponsoring this resolution denouncing the Cuban regime and supporting freedom for the people of Cuba.

On July 11, the world watched as thousands of Cubans peacefully took to the streets calling for libertad, meaning freedom or liberty. But the Castro thugs responded by cracking their heads open in the streets of Havana. Ever since, countless dissidents have been arrested, and hundreds more have disappeared.

But what is encouraging is that these young men and women of unbelievable courage cannot be stopped.

And do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because their hunger to pursue freedom and to pursue happiness drives them, and that is bigger than the stranglehold the Castro regime has put on them for 60 years. Apparently, freedom is bigger than fear, and that is why, in 10 days from today, on November 15, these brave freedom fighters will flood the streets of Cuba once again.

Already, the Castro repressive apparatus is showing its ugly head. That is why we, the United States Congress, the seat of power in this shining city on a hill the whole world is watching, must approve this resolution today to express solidarity with the Cuban people.

We are demanding that peaceful protesters be allowed to assemble without fear of being brutalized. We are condemning the heinous crimes committed by this tyrannical regime. We are calling now on the Biden administration peacefully and respectfully to provide internet to Cuba.

We are on the cusp of momentous change for that island. We are less than 2 weeks away from another heroic demonstration by the Cuban people. We are less than 2 weeks away from another violent crackdown by the regime.

These pictures right here are evidence. They came straight from Cuban television. Castro's civilian gestapo, armed with clubs, is ready to attack those who will dare to shout "libertad" on the streets of Cuba because in Cuba protesters are brutalized, detained, and beaten. They are jailed and charged with treason because in the eyes of this murderous regime, free speech is a crime and liberty is illegal.

This resolution from the United States House of Representatives will send a message loud and clear that we will always stand on the side of freedom, democracy, and human rights and that the Castro regime's days are numbered. May the Lord allow for that.

The world is watching, and it is time for the Cubans to be free like Americans, like we all are.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 760.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who is a great champion for human rights and an outspoken champion for those human rights when they are violated so close to our own shores.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership as well on human rights worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise to urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 760. I authored this bipartisan resolution coled by my dear friend, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, to send a message to the brave Cubans who are desperately yearning for freedom and legitimate self-governance: The American people are firmly by your side.

The passionate human cry for self-determination ringing out from the streets of Havana has moved this Congress and achieved something beautiful and all too rare. It has united Democrats and Republicans behind this call for freedom.

Today, we are here to do something simple and unifying that is at the heart of American values: support human rights and freedom of expression and freedom from repression.

Today, this body stands arm in arm to condemn the Cuban regime's acts of repression. Together, we proclaim the strongest possible support for the Cuban people to take a courageous stand in the streets on November 15, as they did on July 11, and peacefully express their opposition to the brutality and dehumanization of the Cuban regime.

As representatives of the American people, we proudly express unyielding solidarity with the Cuban people who wish to peacefully assemble and boldly demand their freedom from oppression.

The regime has all the tools of repression in their possession, but the

Cuban people are armed with truth, conviction, and courage. Dictators thrive on silence, lies, and fear. That is why the resolution before this Chamber today is so important. This body must use our platform to shed light on the tyranny that casts a shadow over such a beautiful island.

The Cuban regime's deception, repression, and arbitrary imprisonment of citizens, activists, and artists cannot withstand the people's demands for freedom, agency, and accountability.

□ 1445

By passing this resolution today, we will make sure the Cuban people's calls for freedom are not silenced. Instead, we will amplify them as we are here this afternoon.

And we are not alone. In adopting this resolution, we will join with the European Parliament who adopted a resolution earlier this summer that condemns the Cuban regime's blatant disregard for human rights.

Now we too must loudly proclaim that this Congress stands for democracy and denounces the unaccountable corruption clinging to power just across the Straits of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take one moment to thank all of those, including President Biden, and especially President Biden, for standing with the Cuban people; for standing up for freedom, for free and fair elections on the island, for freedom of expression, and for making sure that we can help hold this unaccountable regime accountable.

I also want to thank those who helped deliver this message today, my good friends: ALBIO STRES, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, and, of course, Leader HOYER. And I also want to thank Chairman MEEKS for working with me on this resolution as well and my colleagues from Florida. Without their hard work and the efforts of many other allies of Cuban democracy, we could not send this powerful, bipartisan message today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. We are united today around the Cuban people's fight for libertad and patria y vida.

I ask all Members to embrace the unifying principles in this resolution which avoids the policy arguments and expresses our support for basic human rights. Who could be against that?

I urge all of my colleagues to stand behind and side by side with the Cuban people and support their pursuit of liberty and justice. I urge a "yes" vote on H. Res. 760.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 760, but let

me just say I, too, support the basic rights of the Cuban people, the basic human rights of the Cuban people. As an African American who has engaged in many protests for justice, I know the impact of keeping government and police forces from interfering in our actions for our basic rights.

We should not excuse the Cuban Government for limiting their own people's freedom and opportunity. But let me just say: Here in Congress, we need to also take a hard look at the failed U.S. policy that has not helped the Cuban people and too often inflicted harm on them. They say insanity is doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result. Well, for 60 years we have been squeezing the Cuban people thinking that if we starve them just enough it will somehow lead to democracy.

So it is long overdue to support policies that truly help the Cuban people. The Obama administration showed us that we can take a new approach. That is through engagement, diplomacy, trade, travel, and, yes, support for human rights for the Cuban people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this resolution on the suspension calendar today and we should have an honest debate about a new Cuban policy that talks about and supports what real human rights for the Cuban people mean.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TED DEUTCH and my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the people of Cuba who deserve the right to stand up peacefully for freedom and basic human rights without fear of repercussions.

This summer, as my colleagues have already described, thousands of Cubans took to the streets peacefully to raise their voices for basics like food, and medicine, access to the internet, for freedom and opportunity in their country. And what was the response by their Cuban Government? Violence and arrests and detention without due process of hundreds of the protesters.

Here is what I think we can all agree with: the ability to speak freely, to rise and protest our fundamental human rights that everyone deserves, no matter where they live in the world, and that is whether you are marching here in Washington, or in south Florida, or on the streets of Havana. We must continue to support and stand up for those who are standing up for fundamental freedoms. And we must condemn the acts of violence and undue repercussions against people for exercising these rights.

So today, by passing this important resolution, we take a stand and we shine a spotlight on these blatant attacks on human rights in Cuba by condemning the acts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just join those in condemning the acts of repression by the Cuban regime and call for the immediate release of Cuban citizens arbitrarily detained. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. DEUTCH for yielding and for his strong leadership on this issue, and I certainly want to thank my classmate, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for bringing this bill to the floor, plus all of the Members in a bipartisan way. I thank them so much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my solidarity with the Cuban people who have exercised their human rights to peacefully demonstrate for their rightful freedoms and their liberty, their libertad. This past July thousands of Cuban citizens took to the streets and in unison, they chanted: libertad, libertad—liberty, liberty.

They protested for freedom. They protested for liberty. They protested for vida—life—and for patria—also country. They wanted a change after more than six decades of authoritarian rule.

Demonstrators were shown waving American flags symbolizing the liberty that they so desperately want. One protester remarked to the press: It felt so good to finally be able to protest in our country. It is only human to feel fear, but that moved to the background because you knew that we were doing the right thing. The Cuban Government reacted to such demonstrations with unjust imprisonment of hundreds of protesters, and, of course, they cut off people's access to the internet as part of the government's crackdown.

In closing, the people of Cuba deserve the right to protest. They have the right to have freedom—libertad—patria y vida.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we support this legislation and pass this.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DEUTCH for yielding.

In recent years, the living conditions for the Cuban people have deteriorated rapidly. Shortages of basic goods like food, medicine, even hygienic products like diapers, have become the norm. Socialism and communism have truly failed. The economy has collapsed and in order to maintain power, leaders have only tightened their stranglehold on the people.

The Cuban people have responded. This past summer we witnessed his-

tory. Cubans from all walks of life peacefully took to the streets demanding reform and freedom. They were met with violence. Since then, demonstrators have been rounded up, and show trials, arbitrary detentions, and crackdowns on thought and speech have followed. Activists are still missing and have not been seen for months. Our hearts are with the Cuban exile community, nearly 1.6 million in Florida alone, including many second- and third-generation Floridians.

They call America home because they cannot call Cuba home due to the violent, Communist dictatorship. This resolution is an important statement by the people's House that we will not stand by while Cubans suffer and die. And we will lead the international community in holding the Communist regime accountable. Please vote "yes."

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, the people of Florida stand with the people of Cuba.

I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), another colleague from Florida.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, during his inaugural address in 1960, President Kennedy said these words: "Let every nation know . . . that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

We know what freedom means in America. It is the lifeline of our Nation. The people of Cuba have cried out for freedom, and because of who we are, America must answer the call.

The failed socialist regime in Cuba has delivered tyranny instead of freedom, poverty instead of prosperity, and violence to silence its own people instead of protection and safety. We denounce that regime and we stand with the people because we stand for freedom.

One protester said this: "It's only human to feel fear but that moved to the background because you knew you were doing the right thing."

I say to America, this statement should be familiar to all of us. We will not stay neutral for neutrality helps the oppressor, never the oppressed. Democracy and a free economy are the right path forward for Cuba.

We stand today and we support this resolution so that every Cuban, like every American and every Floridian, will know that they have a God-given right to safety, liberty, and the right to freely choose their own future. Together we stand.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), my colleague.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan resolution.

This resolution honors the Cuban people who have protested peacefully at great personal risk for their fundamental freedoms and a brighter future for their families. These are men and women of courage and character, confronting a ruthless and repressive regime.

Our resolution sends these patriots a simple message: America has your back.

I feel a deep sense of solidarity with the Cuban people. When I was a baby, my family fled a Communist country, and like many Cuban families, we found refuge and opportunity in America. And like so many Cuban Americans, I never take for granted the rights I am afforded in this country because I know what the alternative looks like.

Following the historic protests in Cuba, I offered a bipartisan amendment to an appropriations bill that would have increased funding to support democracy, human rights, political prisoners, and internet access in Cuba. To my grave disappointment, this amendment was prevented from coming to the floor of the House by members of my own party.

America must speak and act with moral clarity. We should support men and women standing up to authoritarian regimes across the globe, and especially in our shared neighborhood. I urge support for this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, let it be known, just 90 miles off the coast of our State of Florida is a murderous, socialist dictatorship that is murdering and crushing its people. Let it also be known across this Nation that Democrats and Republicans are coming together today to express solidarity with Cuban citizens demonstrating peacefully for fundamental freedoms and democracy.

We saw it this summer when they took to the streets on the island as well as across our country including in Orlando. I was proud to stand in solidarity. Resolutions expressing support are important, but so is action, which is why, after this is done, we need to pursue other, more substantive policies like: stopping enslavement of Cuban doctors, putting more pressure for internet access on the island; addressing Havana syndrome and the attack on our diplomats, sanctions and U.N. action to stop even some of our own U.N. European allies from continuing to prop up this dictatorship. That will make a big difference.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, before we vote on this, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the driving force behind this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Libertad para Cuba. Patria y vida.

(English translation of Spanish is as follows: Freedom for Cuba. Country and life.)

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to first associate myself with the comments that the majority leader made at the beginning of his comments, where he described a significant overlap, a place here where both parties can come together to support this resolution. We all agree on the importance of human rights.

I am hopeful a dialogue on the policy differences that he mentioned occurs soon. The shift toward authoritarianism in Latin America continues, and I believe most of this body recognizes Cuba's hand in all of that.

Patria y vida. Cuba libre.

(English translation of Spanish is as follows: Country and life. Free Cuba.)

Once again, I want to thank my friends, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. SIRES, for leading this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. GREEN. I want to thank Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. DIAZ-BALART, as well as our good friend Mr. SIRES, all of them, for their bipartisan leadership of this important resolution. I want to thank Senator MENENDEZ and Senator RUBIO for the same.

We have the opportunity today here, at this moment, to show unequivocally that the United States stands with the people of Cuba, that we stand with them in their desire for basic rights, that we want to see relations between the United States and the Cuban people flourish, that we support today and will always support the Cuban people in their pursuit of freedom, the right to free expression, and the right to live and be free.

I thank the bill sponsors for their important work on this resolution. I urge all of my colleagues to stand for human rights, to stand with the people of Cuba, and to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 760.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1516

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

REINFORCING NICARAGUA'S ADHERENCE TO CONDITIONS FOR ELECTORAL REFORM ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1064) to advance the strategic alignment of United States diplomatic tools toward the realization of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua and to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to protect the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of Nicaragua, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 35, answered "present" 4, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—387

Adams	Bost	Chu
Aderholt	Bourdeaux	Cicilline
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)
Allen	F.	Cleaver
Allred	Brady	Cline
Amodei	Brooks	Cloud
Armstrong	Brown	Clyburn
Arrington	Brownley	Clyde
Auchincloss	Buchanan	Cole
Axne	Bucshon	Comer
Babin	Budd	Connolly
Bacon	Burchett	Cooper
Baird	Burgess	Correa
Balderson	Bustos	Costa
Banks	Butterfield	Courtney
Barr	Calvert	Craig
Barragán	Cammack	Crawford
Bass	Carbajal	Crenshaw
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crist
Bentz	Carl	Crow
Bera	Carson	Cuellar
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Curtis
Beyer	Carter (LA)	Davids (KS)
Bice (OK)	Carter (TX)	Davidson
Bilirakis	Cartwright	Davis, Danny K.
Bishop (GA)	Case	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (NC)	Casten	Dean
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Blunt Rochester	Cawthorn	DeBene
Boebert	Chabot	Delgado
Bonamici	Cheney	Demings

DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallo
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (NY)
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kabele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna

Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Porter
Posey
Price (NC)

Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—35

Biggs
Bowman
Buck
Bush
Clarke (NY)
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Espallat
Evans
Gaetz
Garcia (IL)
Green, Al (TX)

Greene (GA)
Grijalva
Huffman
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Lee (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lowenthal
Massie
McCollum
McGovern

Newman
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pocan
Pressley
Rosendale
Smith (WA)
Stansbury
Takano
Tlaib
Waters

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Cohen
DeFazio
Duncan
Torres (NY)

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL)
Lesko
Miller-Meeks
Simpson
Vela

□ 1614

Messrs. GRIJALVA, ESPAILLAT, and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HERN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM changed her vote from “present” to “nay.”

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne
(Spanberger)
Bowman (Tlaib)
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Doggett (Raskin)
Frankel, Lois
(Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Greene
(GA))
Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Gomez)

Hagedorn (Carl)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Meng (Jeffries)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)

Steube
(Franklin, C.
Scott)
Strickland
(Jeffries)
Swalwell
(Gomez)
Trone (Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH CUBAN CITIZENS FOR FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 760) expressing solidarity with Cuban citizens demonstrating peacefully for fundamental freedoms, condemning the Cuban regime's acts of repression, and calling for the immediate release of arbitrarily detained Cuban citizens, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 40, answered “present” 4, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

YEAS—382

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell

Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (NY)
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kabele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna

Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin

Reed	Sherman	Torres (CA)
Reschenthaler	Sherrill	Torres (NY)
Rice (NY)	Sires	Trahan
Rice (SC)	Slotkin	Trone
Rodgers (WA)	Smith (MO)	Turner
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Underwood
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Rose	Smith (WA)	Valadao
Rosendale	Smucker	Van Drew
Ross	Soto	Van Dуйne
Rouzer	Spanberger	Vargas
Roy	Spartz	Veasey
Roybal-Allard	Speier	Wagner
Ruiz	Stanton	Walberg
Ruppersberger	Stauber	Walorski
Rutherford	Steel	Waltz
Ryan	Stefanik	Wasserman
Salazar	Steil	Schultz
Sánchez	Steube	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Stevens	Weber (TX)
Scalise	Stewart	Webster (FL)
Scanlon	Strickland	Wenstrup
Schakowsky	Suozzi	Westerman
Schiff	Swalwell	Wexton
Schneider	Taylor	Wild
Schrader	Tenney	Williams (GA)
Schrier	Thompson (CA)	Williams (TX)
Schweikert	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Scott, Austin	Tiffany	Wittman
Scott, David	Timmons	Womack
Sessions	Titus	Young
Sewell	Tonko	Zeldin

NAYS—40

Bowman	Jacobs (CA)	Payne
Bush	Jayapal	Pingree
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Porter
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Pressley
DeGette	Levin (MI)	Rush
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Stansbury
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Takano
Doyle, Michael	McGovern	Tlaib
F.	Meng	Velázquez
Evans	Moore (WI)	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Nadler	Welch
Grijalva	Ocasio-Cortez	Yarmuth
Huffman	Omar	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Castro (TX)	Gomez
Cohen	Massie

NOT VOTING—5

Brady	Murphy (NC)	Vela
Lesko	Simpson	

□ 1634

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne	Hagedorn (Carl)	Steube
(Spanberger)	Kirkpatrick	(Franklin, C.
Bowman (Tlaib)	(Stanton)	Scott)
Cárdenas	Lawson (FL)	Strickland
(Gomez)	(Evans)	(Jeffries)
Doggett (Raskin)	Meng (Jeffries)	Swalwell
Frankel, Lois	Payne (Pallone)	(Gomez)
(Clark (MA))	Pingree (Kuster)	Trone (Connolly)
Gaetz (Greene	Rush	Wilson (FL)
(GA))	(Underwood)	(Hayes)
Gonzalez,	Sires (Pallone)	
Vicente	Speier (Scanlon)	
(Gomez)		

PROTECT OLDER JOB APPLICANTS ACT OF 2021

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 716, I call up the bill (H.R. 3992) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying applicants for employment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-14 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3992

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protect Older Job Applicants Act of 2021" or "POJA Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST LIMITING, SEGREGATING, OR CLASSIFYING APPLICANTS FOR EMPLOYMENT.

Section 4(a)(2) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "or applicants for employment" after "employees", and

(2) by inserting "or as an applicant for employment" after "employee".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act of 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protect Older Job Applicants Act of 2021.

Protecting all workers from workplace discrimination is of the utmost importance. Unfortunately, older workers have disproportionately been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic with more workers over the age of 65 leaving the workforce in 2020 than in any year over the last six decades.

The Protect Older Job Applicants Act of 2021 would help address discrimination older workers face in the hiring process, and it is an especially important step toward helping older workers reenter the workforce as the Nation recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Currently, the disparate impact provision in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the ADEA, covers older employees seeking relief from age

discrimination, but not older job applicants. The bill we are considering today would clarify the disparate impact provision and make clear that older job applicants, not just older employees, are protected.

This bill is a commonsense fix to the ADEA that would help protect workers from ageist hiring practices. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administrative Policy in support of H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act of 2021.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3992—PROTECT OLDER JOB APPLICANTS ACT OF 2021—REP. GARCIA, D-TX, AND 62 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of the Protect Older Job Applicants (POJA) Act of 2021. The legislation would amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967, which prohibits, among other actions, age-based discrimination in hiring, to specifically prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying job applicants on the basis of age.

The POJA Act of 2021 provides a critical clarification to support older Americans during recruitment and hiring, ensuring the ADEA's nondiscrimination protections extend fully to older job applicants.

Workplace age discrimination, including at the application stage, prevents people from fully accessing the American dream and limits the contributions that they can make to our shared prosperity. Ensuring equitable access to employment is a priority for the Administration. The Administration supports this legislation that protects older job applicants.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3992, the more appropriately named profiting off of older job applicants act.

This, like so many other Democrat proposals, is a trial lawyer payout disguised as a win for older workers. Democrats are addicted to inventing problems that fit their slanted narrative of American life. To liberal Democrats, older workers are vulnerable employees who can't cut it in the modern economy, and that could not be further from the truth. In fact, employment for workers ages 65 and older tripled from 1988 to 2018, the last 30 years, while employment for younger workers only grew by a third.

During that same time, the number of workers aged 75 and older nearly quadrupled. Despite what Democrats may have you believe, there are several existing laws already protecting Americans of all ages against discrimination in the workplace.

One of those legal protections which today's bill would amend is the Age Discrimination and Employment Act of 1967, or the ADEA. It prohibits employment discrimination based on age for job applicants and employees at least 40 years old and up, as it should. Discrimination is wrong. It is immoral, and it must be vigilantly addressed.

But this bill radically expands the definition of discrimination against

older job applicants by authorizing claims against a disparate impact theory; again, what happens, not what is intended by the employers. This needlessly interferes with employers' routine recruitment and hiring practices.

The ADEA already prohibits discrimination against job applicants, but the ADEA does not authorize disparate impact claims by job applicants.

Congress has long recognized that addressing different forms of discrimination require different laws. For example, Congress did not include age in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but passed a separate and distinct law in 1967 prohibiting age discrimination; once again, the ADEA.

Yet, H.R. 3992, this bill, abandons congressional precedence and imprudently allows disparate impact claims by job applicants under the ADEA. The most destructive impact of this bill would be the assault on existing programs that employers are using all across the country which creates job opportunities for workers, students, and prospective employees.

□ 1645

Under this bill, routine recruiting efforts at high schools, Job Corps centers, and colleges, including job fairs, would be legally suspect because these students are typically younger, on average.

In addition, simply posting a job opening on a job search website could land an employer in a world of trouble because users of those websites tend to be younger.

Apprenticeship and internship programs would also be threatened because the participants tend to be younger, and employers tend to hire full-time employees from these programs.

These examples are not mere speculation. The AARP, one of the Democrats' favorite big donors, has already backed class action litigation challenging college recruitment as violating the ADEA.

If this bill is enacted into law, a tsunami of lawsuits attacking these valuable and effective programs would follow, putting millions of job opportunities in jeopardy and forcing employers into court to defend them. But that is what our friends across the aisle seem to want.

Endangering hiring practices, when there are over 10 million unfilled jobs, flies in the face of common sense and good governance. Surely, my Democrat colleagues know better.

They should also be aware of their own hypocrisy, as I can assure you that every Member of Congress has recruited from colleges, universities, or on job search sites to fill staff and intern positions, the vast majority of which have been hires of younger age.

By failing to hold even a single hearing on this bill and refusing to adopt any commonsense Republican amendments, Democrats exposed their true intentions, to rush through yet another

piece of misguided legislation to appease the left.

Additionally, Democrats refused to allow floor debate on commonsense amendments offered by Republicans to protect job opportunities for workers and determine whether the bill is even necessary.

For example, Representative MILLER-MEEKS submitted an amendment to make sure the bill does not prohibit an employer from recruiting or interviewing students attending high schools, Job Corps centers, colleges, or universities.

Representative ALLEN submitted an amendment to ensure the bill does not prohibit employers from operating apprenticeship or internship programs, and Representative LETLOW submitted an amendment to protect employers' ability to post job openings on job search websites.

If this were truly about crafting high-quality legislation that protects older job applicants, then this bill's sponsors should have been clamoring for a thorough and bipartisan analysis of this bill.

This legislation was first introduced in June of this year and considered by the committee only a month later. Now, we are here debating it on the floor without any meaningful review.

Because H.R. 3992 was rushed through the legislative process, we cannot even begin to understand its sweeping and unintended consequences. But what we do know about this bill should concern every Member of this body.

The profiting off older job applicants act will jeopardize job opportunities for millions of Americans, both young and old, and will make the Democrats' trial lawyer friends yet richer, once again.

Congress and the Supreme Court have long recognized that different forms of discrimination require different legal solutions. This bill abandons that precedent and will not only set off a slew of legal challenges, but it will also hamstring our job creators attempting to rebuild during a once-in-a-century pandemic and inflation crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this misguided legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the record on a couple of points. In fact, the committee did have a hearing on this subject on March 18, 2021, in the Subcommittee of Civil Rights and Human Services. It was a hearing called "Fighting for Fairness: Examining Legislation to Confront Workplace Discrimination."

Additionally, my colleague's argument simply misstates the law with regard to places like college campuses or online recruitment. For example, employers will always have the freedom to choose the time, place, and manner in which they recruit. Whether it be on a college campus or LinkedIn, employers face no risk of liability if they can

show it was based on reasonable factors other than age, such as a larger pool of highly trained individuals from which to recruit.

The argument that anyone who wasn't available to be recruited on LinkedIn or enrolled in college would be able to sue an employer for age discrimination is a misunderstanding of this law, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Title VII has outlawed disparate impact discrimination since 1972. If there are any doubts that these sorts of laws would wipe out recruiting practices, we would have seen those consequences. In fact, this law is to correct a couple of circuits that have gone a different way from the rest of the country. In 9 out of 11 circuits, it is already the law. So any parade of horrors that my colleague is suggesting, we would have seen that already and we have not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 3992, the Protecting Older Job Applicants Act of 2021.

I want to start by thanking my Republican co-lead on this bill, the dean of the House, Congressman DON YOUNG of Alaska. I also want to thank Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, my Democratic co-lead, for his tireless leadership to protect all workers, but especially older workers and older jobseekers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will fix a loophole in current law that fails to protect older job applicants during the hiring process.

Despite what many people assume, older job applicants are not protected under the current Age Discrimination in Employment Act protections, commonly called ADEA.

Mr. Speaker, my bill seeks to fix this. This bill would allow older job applicants to bring claims for disparate impact discrimination hiring against employers.

While that may sound like legal technicalities and legal mumbo-jumbo to some people watching back home, Mr. Speaker, disparate impact claims are very, very important. They are important because some hiring practices might seem age-neutral on their face, but they actually impact job applicants that are older disproportionately.

The bill would clarify the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to give job applicants the right to bring these claims forward. Three-fourths of workers age 45 and older blame age discrimination for their lack of confidence in finding a new job.

But it is not just simple statistics. It is about real people and real stories.

It is like one of my neighbors, an engineer who can't find meaningful work after losing his job. He is about 60, but he is always told he is too experienced and overqualified. But he says it is all about his age.

It is about Rebecca in California, who is age 75, forced to provide her birth

Pro Tip: Claire Turner said it's not enough to simply acquire knowledge and skills—you have to be able to communicate those assets to potential employers, while still sounding humble. For instance, if you have always been a dependable worker, you would say something like, "Past employers say my attendance is perfect . . . you want to say people 'say' I am good at this. That's always a great way to deliver that message," Turner said.

A bright spot: Turner said she is seeing evidence that the tight job market created by a low unemployment rate is helping older workers who are unemployed.

"Employers are very open to older workers that they may not have been before," Turner said.

We checked back with Hinton four months after our first visit. She has seen no sign of that new openness to older workers. Hinton's situation had become more desperate.

A few temporary gigs had come and gone, but she had yet to land a permanent job, despite decades of customer service experience, much of it in management.

The lack of employment was impacting most aspects of her life:

Housing: "Of course, the house, we don't want to lose it. It may get to that point—not maybe soon—but maybe in the next six (months) to a year."

Health: "I have medication I can't afford so I don't take it."

Retirement funds (which have depleted some): "I don't even want to check my Fidelity account."

We asked her how many jobs she has applied for since she lost permanent employment two years ago.

"Oh my God!" she said. "I would say . . . over 250. I got out of that . . . maybe 10 interviews."

That lines up with a 2017 study done by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, in which researchers sent out tens of thousands of fictitious applications from different aged artificial applicants who had similar backgrounds. They found that younger workers were significantly more likely to get a call back from prospective employers than older workers were.

"I'm articulate," she said. "I have an energy. I'm not dead. Whatever the curse is . . . whatever it is it needs to go away."

Worried that her expansive resume might make her look overqualified (and over age), she shortened it from four pages to two.

Pro Tip: Claire Turner at The Senior Source said, "When I was looking, I had 25 resumes. Every single word was true, but I had three different careers. We see all the time people walk in with a resume that is very impressive, with all these years of experience. They present that for a customer service position and there is no correlation. The employer doesn't even understand why you applied. So it is a matter of tailoring your resume. It is definitely honest and factual; it is just showing things that are relevant. The industry standard is that people only show the last ten years."

As we wrapped up our second visit with Hinton, she was still filling out applications. But she had also just received another rejection email.

"It says, 'Dear Diana, thanks for your interest in our customer service position. Unfortunately you have not been selected to continue in our process for this position.'"

Her dog, Maxwell, rests at her feet.

"Maybe he is my calm," Hinton said. "He's calming me."

Hinton wonders if she will ever leave him again to go back to work.

"I am pretty strong, but I am almost sliding down, and I have to keep telling myself, 'Come on, Diana, you can do this.' I didn't think it was going to be this hard."

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill will help people trying to recover from this pandemic, including people who lost their job in the middle of their career who now fear they will never work again because of discriminatory hiring practices.

This is not about trial lawyers. It is not anything about what some of my colleagues across the aisle have talked about. It is just a simple clarification bill. It clarifies that job protections for older Americans begin at the time of the application.

I want to thank the AARP, the National Council on Aging, the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, the American Federation of Government Employees, and the White House for supporting efforts and this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letters of endorsement for this bill from the AARP and the National Council on Aging that I just mentioned.

AARP,
September 27, 2021.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, AARP writes in support of H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act (POJA), important legislation sponsored by Rep. Sylvia Garcia (D-TX) to protect older job applicants against age discrimination.

Older workers are valuable assets to their employers and the economy, and additional protections are needed as the country recovers from COVID-19. Despite their value, 78 percent of older workers reported having seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace in 2020, up markedly from 61 percent in 2018. The pandemic has significantly diminished the job prospects and future retirement security of older workers. Americans age 55 and up experience long-term unemployment at a higher rate compared to younger job seekers and age discrimination makes it harder for them to return to the workforce.

We are pleased that this bill extends Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) protections to job applicants so everyone will have an equal opportunity when applying for a job. H.R. 3992 complements the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (H.R. 2062), a bipartisan, common-sense bill that the House of Representatives passed on June 23. POJA goes a step further to ensure the legal rights of applicants for jobs are protected as well.

AARP strongly supports POJA and urges you to enact it as soon as possible:

Sincerely,

BILL SWEENEY,
Senior Vice President,
Government Affairs.

NCOA,

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON AGING,

July 23, 2021.

Hon. SYLVIA R. GARCIA,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GARCIA: On behalf of the National Council on Aging, I am pleased to endorse your legislation to strengthen protections for older workers under the Protect Older Job Applicants Act of 2021 (H.R. 3992).

Ageism is one of the last socially acceptable forms of discrimination in our society—and it remains stubbornly ingrained in too many workplaces. AARP research shows that in 2020, nearly 80 percent of older workers reported having seen or experienced age discrimination at work.

As age discrimination has increased during the pandemic, so have job losses among older workers. Nearly 2 million workers aged 55 and older were unemployed in June, and 55.3 percent were long-term unemployed (27 weeks or longer), a rate that exceeds that of their younger counterparts. Research from The New School Schwartz Center for Economic Policy Analysis reveals that another 1.7 million older adults abandoned the job search and retired earlier than anticipated, setting many of them up for financial insecurity in their later years.

As Congress takes steps to promote economic recovery and job creation and placement, Age Discrimination in Employment (ADEA) protections must be restored and strengthened. In 2019, the 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Public Appeals (Kleber v. CareFusion Corp., No. 17-1206) ruled that ADEA protections apply only to current employees and do not extend to external applicants. The Protect Older Job Applicants Act will restore the original ADEA intent and clarify and codify these crucial protections for older workers seeking new employment.

It's time to treat age discrimination the same as every other unlawful bias in the workplace. We applaud your leadership on behalf of older workers and urge Congress to pass your legislation quickly to ensure they have equal access to employment opportunities as the economy recovers and into the future.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY ALWIN,
President and CEO.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, together we can and will protect older workers during the hiring phase of employment with this bill. Everyone deserves a shot at the American Dream, regardless of their age. This is common sense. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan bill, protecting our older workers.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, we heard about the justification for this legislation, and we are discussing older job applicants. Just some context that I would like to add about how well older job applicants and workers have been faring in recent decades.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for workers age 65 and older, employment tripled from 1988 to 2018, while employment among younger workers only grew by about one-third.

Among people age 75 and older, the number of employed people nearly quadrupled, increasing from 461,000 in 1998 to 1.8 million in 2018.

The labor force participation rate for older workers has been steadily increasing since the late 1990s, while participation rates for younger age groups either declined or flattened during the same period.

Over the past 20 years, the number of older workers on full-time work schedules grew 2½ times faster than the number working part time.

Full-time employees are now a majority of older workers. They were 61 percent in 2018, up from 46 percent in 1998.

These statistics paint a picture of rising full-time employment among older workers, and they do not portray rampant discrimination against older job applicants.

As the economy recovers from the pandemic, older workers will continue to prosper.

H.R. 3992 is yet another Democrat bill in search of a problem. It will result in an avalanche of class action litigation against employers for using standard, reasonable recruiting methods, and I encourage a “no” vote on the bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note that the reality is that there is substantial evidence that older workers are routinely harmed by plausibly neutral but age-discriminate hiring practices.

For example, in 2017, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco conducted a study on age discrimination and hiring by sending similar resumes to 13,000 job openings in 12 cities, totaling 40,000 applicants. For all five job position types they studied, the callback rate was higher for younger applicants and lower for older applicants, consistent with age discrimination in hiring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1700

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker and I thank the manager very much, and I thank Congresswoman GARCIA of Texas for her leadership and sponsorship of H.R. 3992, Protect Older Job Applicants Act. It is long overdue and an important initiative.

Words from Patti Temple Rocks, communications professional, really capture what this bill is about: “I was still on my game, but I was being moved . . . to make room for someone younger.”

Let me be very clear. There is a great opportunity for all of us to be employed, and that is what this legislation says. It is specifically making sure that every American worker is protected. Specifically, this bill will make it unlawful to limit, segregate, or classify job applicants in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his or her status as a job applicant because of such individual's age.

This bill will include the job application process in ADEA's antidiscrimination provisions and, again, disallow anyone from classifying you and discriminating because of age.

H.R. 3992 would give external candidates the express right under Federal law to bring these types of claims against employers. What I would simply say to my friends, this is to prohibit but it is also to prevent or intervene so that employers can know the right things to do.

According to AARP, one in four workers age 45 and older have been subjected to negative comments about their age from supervisors or coworkers, and 76 percent age discrimination find that as a hurdle in helping to find a new job.

We also recognize that there is a lot of talent with older workers. Paradoxically, what most companies do not seem to understand is that older workers possess a depth of knowledge and experience that is worth paying for and is not easily replaced and can be tapped in from many different ways; and, as well, having a mix of people of all generations, able and ready, and disabled, if you will, to work alongside of each other.

“People walk out of companies now with an enormous amount of intellectual property in their heads,” says Paul Rupert, the founder and CEO of Respectful Exits, a nonprofit consulting firm that is raising corporate awareness about age discrimination. “They know things that are essential to the company's success, and if that knowledge is not captured and transmitted to the next generation, that company is losing a tremendous chunk of capital, and it will eventually pay a price.”

So what is the point? The point is to recognize how important it is to ensure that we don't discriminate. In fact, women age 40 are finding that if they lose a job they, too, are being discriminated against in terms of getting a job.

I want to, again, salute the sponsor of this legislation, the manager of this legislation, and of course, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Chairman SCOTT, along with all of those who supported this to ensure this is about fairness.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, we always promote equal justice. We partner with the Education and Labor Committee in its work on equal justice. So this is legislation that provides opportunities for equal justice, and I would ask my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 3992, Protect Older Job Applicants Act. But more importantly, let's protect the intellectual capital of all Americans, every job applicant.

Let there not be discrimination against you for race or color or creed or disability or gender or anything else, and certainly have respect for that intellectual capital that older American workers bring to the workforce. Let's celebrate it; let's have a

good time with it; and let's build our companies on all of this genius that happens to be the American workers now today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3992, the “Protect Older Job Applicants Act,” which will amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, which prohibits age-based discrimination in hiring, to specifically prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying job applicants on the basis of age.

People of all ages, but especially older applicants, must be protected from discriminatory practices and loopholes that hurt their chances to get a job, especially as we have seen that older American workers have disproportionately experienced long-term unemployment in the COVID economy.

The federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 was passed to prohibit age-based discrimination for current employees and job applicants.

However, two federal circuit court decisions over the last five years have ruled that some provisions of the ADEA's federal anti-age discrimination protections only applied to current employees, not job applicants.

In 2016, the 11th Circuit case *Villarreal v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company* held that the ADEA disparate impact statute only covers employees, but not older applicants, and in 2019, the 7th Circuit adopted the same interpretation in *Kleber v. CareFusion Corporation*.

The U.S. Supreme Court has declined to review the appellate court decisions.

Currently, employers, especially those within the 7th and 11th Circuits, have a valid defense to claims under the ADEA where external job applicants allege they have been negatively impacted by hiring practices on the basis of their age.

H.R. 3992 would give external candidates the express right under federal law to bring these types of claims against employers.

This bill will include the job application process in ADEA's antidiscrimination provisions.

Specifically, this bill will make it unlawful “to limit, segregate, or classify . . . [job applicants] in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as . . . [a job applicant], because of such individual's age.”

According to the AARP, 1 in 4 workers age 45 and older have been subjected to negative comments about their age from supervisors or coworkers, and 76 percent see age discrimination as a hurdle to finding a new job.

In one University of California, Irvine, study, résumés were sent out on behalf of more than 40,000 fictitious applicants of different ages for thousands of low-skill jobs like janitors, administrative assistants and retail sales clerks in 12 cities.

This study found that the older the applicant was, the fewer callbacks the applicant received.

This study also found that age discrimination has the highest impact on women, who suffer more age discrimination than men starting in their 40s.

According to David Neumark, a professor of economics who oversaw the study, “[t]he evidence of age discrimination against women . . . pops out in every study” conducted on age discrimination.

Ageism is still very much present in our society, and it is important we acknowledge that we still have much work to do to correct this bias and give every job applicant a fair and equal opportunity when applying for a job.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on the underlying bill, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a recruiter for a for-profit corporation. I did that for 15 years where I had the responsibility of recruiting on college campuses and hiring and making those decisions for a company for which I was depended on to find the absolute best workers, and that was not during a time when we had 10 million open jobs in the country and companies so desperate to find quality workers and fill those positions. I did this for a company that was vulnerable to the very consequences that we want to bring in greater capacity here today on this House floor.

Once again, we have got House Democrats trying to solve a nonexistent crisis instead of the many that they have created; massive spending, rising crime, gas prices going through the roof, increased inflation for groceries and other things, surging illegals across the border, firing cops and nurses and first responders because they don't get a vaccine that we are forcing upon them.

Instead of dealing with those, this majority is here focused instead on yet another manufactured problem with yet another leftist solution that has the added benefit from their perspective of paying off their trial lawyer donors.

They miss the point about disparate impact. As an example, a job recruiter goes to a college campus, spends several days recruiting, happens to only have typical younger, college-age workers apply, hires some of those workers, and now their trial lawyer friends would sue them because they didn't hire any older workers when no older workers applied because they used a typical standard practice for hiring entry-level workers. That is a real example.

They don't understand the difference between impact and treatment. We already have laws prohibiting the practice of disparate treatment on age discrimination basis.

This misnamed piece of legislation does nothing to truly protect older job applicants. Again, older job applicants are already protected by the law, and age discrimination is already illegal. Democrats just want to raise the stakes for their lawyer friends, making it easier to sue and the penalties more severe perhaps so that they can then donate more to Democrat campaigns.

Democrats don't want to acknowledge that sound economic policy, if they could recognize it, is what is good for older Americans; low taxes, less

regulation. That benefits older American job applicants just like everybody else, not more regulation, penalization of employees, and unnecessary victimization.

It has already been said, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, these are the facts. Don't let the facts get involved with bad legislation. I know, don't interfere. But the facts show, and I would like my colleagues across the aisle to explain the problem with the facts, that the number of workers age 75 and older in the workforce has quadrupled in the last 30 years, rising from 461,000 in 1988 to 1.8 million in 2018.

But, again, this legislation is about trial lawyers, not older Americans, and this bill would serve as yet another burden on small business owners.

In the age of online job postings and digital recruiting, this legislation would make employers vulnerable for any form of recruiting that brings in younger applicants. Online job boards, social media, even the simple act of posting a position online could be challenged under this bill simply because younger applicants tend to apply through those processes and search for jobs through those mechanisms.

The unintended—or, I suspect, the truly intended—consequence of this bill would be countless class action lawsuits against employers who are already struggling under Democrat efforts to cripple our economy.

Democrats have spent 2 years closing businesses with lockdowns, firing employees with their vaccine mandates, and paying more people to stay home. Here's another way: Let them benefit from a trial lawyer who sues on their behalf under this bill. Heck, even Members of this very body are staying home rather than attending committee hearings or voting in this Chamber. And now that America is trying to reopen in spite of them, Democrats want to have their trial lawyer friends sue more business employers and job creators.

What we do on this floor has consequences that reach into every corner of this great Nation; a sad and dangerous reality under this majority this year. But Democrats are relentless in their determination to pass legislation with a compassionate title—it sounds good—for a manufactured crisis and a policy that hurts small businesses and kills jobs. It is what they do.

As I said before, the Democrat majority has unveiled contempt for employers, businesses, and job creators, and they continue to perpetuate this “us against them” mind set between employees and employers or employers and job applicants. They truly believe that employers are hostile to and exploitive of their employees, and they need more regulation, again, when we have 10 million job openings and employers desperate to fill those positions so they can stay open.

The socialist America that the left clearly wants is not the America that our constituents and millions of Amer-

icans know and love; as the results in Virginia and New Jersey clearly showed last night, bipartisan results, because there are not that many Republicans in Virginia or New Jersey to deliver those results.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I do want to note with regard to my colleague's remarks, I believe there is a House rule about not impugning the motives of people who are here on this distinguished floor of the House of Representatives.

Older workers are suffering from a higher rate of long-term unemployment versus their younger peers. According to AARP, this has produced devastating consequences during the COVID-19 pandemic, as 74 percent of workers aged 40 to 65 who have lost a job in 2020 reported being unemployed for more than 6 months.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is already the law of the land except for people in two Federal circuits here in the United States. This bill is intended to make a uniform law across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Discrimination is wrong, and it has been illegal in the United States for decades, as it should be.

Older workers are faring well in the workforce without the help from us in Congress, and they don't need a trial lawyer payoff—disguised as a win for older workers—that will threaten routine hiring practices, limit job opportunities, and create a tsunami of parasitic litigation.

We should ensure that our legislation does not have unintended consequences that are negative and harmful, but H.R. 3992 fails miserably in this regard when it comes to protecting older workers and ensuring job opportunities for current and future workers.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 3992, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Passing the bipartisan Protect Older Job Applicants Act should be a priority of every Member of Congress. Republicans and Democrats worked together just a few months ago to advance the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. This bipartisan effort was a major step toward ensuring older workers can assert legal claims to hold employers accountable for disparate treatment that results in age discrimination.

However, we cannot defeat age discrimination in employment if we leave older job applicants behind. Without equal protections, older workers are still being denied job opportunities because of hiring practices that, while not intentionally discriminatory, ultimately exclude workers based on their age.

Providing job applicants with the tools to seek justice for discriminatory hiring practices is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. In 2018 our economy missed out on as much as \$850 billion in gross domestic product because older workers who wished to switch jobs, grow in their jobs, or reenter the workforce were denied that opportunity.

The Protect Older Job Applicants Act addresses this gap in an important ADEA protection and helps older workers eliminate barriers that prevent them from fully contributing to our economy.

More broadly, this legislation will deliver on the promise of the ADEA and help ensure that all older workers, regardless of whether they are looking for a job or already have one, are equally protected against age discrimination under the law in every part of the country.

I want to again thank Ms. GARCIA for her leadership. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, thank you today, the House has an opportunity to support older workers by passing H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act, introduced by Representative GARCIA of Texas.

While Americans are working later in life than ever before, many older workers are finding that their experience can count against them when applying for new jobs. Research shows that three-fourths of workers age 45 and older say age discrimination has eroded their confidence in finding a new job, and more than 40 percent of older job applicants have been asked for age-related information in the hiring process.

For more than half a century, older workers and older job applicants who face age discrimination were equally protected under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, or A-D-E-A.

Earlier this year, House Republicans and Democrats came together to pass the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, which strengthens protections for workers who allege disparate treatment based on age under the A-D-E-A.

Unfortunately, recent decisions in the Seventh and Eleventh Federal Circuit Courts have excluded job applicants from seeking recourse under the disparate impact provision of the A-D-E-A, even while maintaining that same protection for current employees.

This means older job applicants in the Seventh and Eleventh Circuits can only challenge age discrimination in hiring when they prove that an employer intended to discriminate based on age. They are unable to challenge hiring practices that appear neutral, but, in fact, result in a disproportionate, harmful impact on older workers.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court declined to grant review of this matter. Therefore, it is up to Congress to clarify what has otherwise been the law of the land with regard to the coverage of job applicants under the A-D-E-A.

Current law provides recourse for job applicants in most jurisdictions, but not all. By amending the A-D-E-A, this legislation clarifies that older job applicants across the coun-

try can effectively seek justice when they are harmed by age discrimination in hiring.

The Administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy in support of this legislation. It states in part:

“Workplace age discrimination, including at the application stage, prevents people from fully accessing the American dream and limits the contributions that they can make to our shared prosperity. Ensuring equitable access to employment is a priority for the Administration. The Administration supports this legislation that protects older job applicants.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part E of House Report 117-137 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part E of House Report 117-137.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 3. STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall conduct a study to determine the number of claims pending or filed with the Commission since 2015 under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), including claims in closed cases, by job applicants who may have been adversely impacted by age discrimination in the job application process. The Chairman of the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and shall make available to the public, a report that contains the results of the study, including recommendations for best practices to prevent, combat, and address age discrimination in the hiring process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to conduct a study on the number of job applicants impacted by age discrimination and issue recommendations on addressing age discrimination in the job application process.

Nearly half of older job applicants report being asked for age-related information when applying for a job, and three-quarters of workers over the age of 45 lack confidence in their ability to find a new job due to age discrimination.

This poses a significant challenge for workers in my home State of New Hampshire. As a State with an aging workforce, New Hampshire businesses are concerned about both how to attract talent and how to ensure that the institutional knowledge and experience of workers reaching retirement age is passed down. When workers are pushed out of our labor force by age discrimination or by the concern that they may face discrimination, our businesses and communities lose the benefit of their knowledge and experience.

Strengthening age discrimination laws is the right thing to do because it will both protect workers and also serve to help keep them in our labor force at a time when businesses are already struggling to attract talent. In our changing economy, we need to ensure that older workers continue to have opportunities available to them.

We must pass the Protect Older Job Applicants Act to clarify that job applicants can challenge discriminatory hiring practices under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and help us gain a better understanding of the issues that older job applicants face when applying for jobs and the solutions that are needed to stop discriminatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters in support of the underlying legislation, one from the American Federation of Government Employees and one from the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), which represents more than 700,000 federal and District of Columbia employees, I urge you to vote for H.R. 3992, the “Protect Older Job Applicants (POJA) Act of 2021.”

Under existing law, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) only applies to currently employed people seeking recourse in the face of employment discrimination based on age. The ADEA does not cover job applicants who experience age discrimination in hiring, including applicants for federal government positions.

H.R. 3992 extends the protections of the ADEA to external job applicants in addition to employees. Specifically, this legislation would allow job applicants to be able to bring disparate impact discrimination claims under the ADEA. The bill would protect older Americans against employment discrimination that prevent them from even getting a foot in the door. Considering the heightened long-term unemployment struggles older Americans have experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic, this bill is critically important.

Building on our support for H.R. 1230, the “Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act,” AFGE is proud to be a

leader in the fight against all forms of employment discrimination including those affecting older Americans. Please support H.R. 3992, the "Protect Older Job Applicants (POJA) Act of 2021."

Sincerely,

JULIE N. TIPPENS,
Director, Legislative Department.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
OF AGING ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2021.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCAO) is a coalition of 69 national nonprofit organizations concerned with the well-being of America's older population and committed to representing their interests in the policy-making arena. We urge you to strengthen protections for older workers by voting for H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act (POJA) of 2021. POJA would clarify that the Age Discrimination in Employment Act's (ADEA) prohibition against all forms of employment discrimination based on age covers individuals during the hiring phase of employment.

Age discrimination is pervasive and stubbornly entrenched. It often starts in the hiring process when employers circumvent anti-age discrimination laws by using such tactics as setting a maximum number of years of experience that a prospective employer will consider or setting up screening processes that exclude older applicants. In 2020, 78 percent of older workers reported having seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace—a significant increase from 61 percent in 2018. Age discrimination is also pervasive among older women and African American workers—nearly two thirds of women and three-fourths of African Americans say they have seen or experienced workplace discrimination. The COVID-19 pandemic has wreaked havoc on employment for everyone, with older workers taking a harder hit. Those aged 55+ continue to experience long-term unemployment in greater numbers, with 55.3 percent of older jobseekers unemployed for 27 weeks or more as of June 2021, compared to 36 percent of younger workers. The rates were worse for older workers who were black, female, or who did not have a college degree.

Although the ADEA was meant to apply to all forms of age discrimination in hiring, recent court decisions have narrowly interpreted the applicability of ADEA's protections and have excluded job applicants who are subjected to hiring practices that have a discriminatory impact based on age, such as specifying a maximum number of years of experience. The Protect Older Job Applicants Act would clarify that older workers seeking employment should be protected from all forms of age discrimination in hiring.

We urge Congress to swiftly pass the Protect Older Job Applicants Act and clarify the ADEA's prohibition against hiring practices that have a discriminatory impact on older workers.

Sincerely,

KATIE SMITH SLOAN,
Chair.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this amendment is a day late and a dollar short. It requires the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to study the extent of dis-

crimination against job applicants based on age and make recommendations of best practices to prevent discrimination. This study could possibly yield useful information, but it is information we should have obtained before we vote on H.R. 3992.

Further, the amendment tacitly acknowledges that we need more information before we vote on this bill. This is classic ready, fire, aim.

The Committee on Education and Labor rushed to mark up H.R. 3992 only a month after it was introduced without holding a single hearing on the bill, a measure which is sorely lacking the examination that it deserves.

However, the information we do have more than suggests that this bill is unnecessary. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act already prohibits discrimination against job applicants because of age. Moreover, older workers have done well in the job market in recent decades. Again, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for workers age 65 and older, employment tripled from 1988 to 2018, while employment among younger workers only grew by about a third.

This amendment, which requires a study after the underlying bill has already been signed into law, does nothing to address the problems in the bill.

H.R. 3992 will threaten routine recruitment and hiring practices, such as participating in college job fairs and posting to online job boards, at a time when nearly 8 million Americans are unemployed and employers are struggling to find workers to fill the more than 10 million available jobs.

I oppose this amendment, which is a day late and a dollar short, and I strongly oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I will correct the record again on the fact that the committee did hold a hearing on this subject on March 18, 2021.

At that hearing, Laurie McCann, a senior attorney at AARP Foundation, testified about the erosion of protections for older workers in judicial decisions under the ADEA, including specific mention in her testimony of the Seventh Circuit's Kleber decision and its harmful impact on applicants. So, that is well-documented.

This particular amendment seeks to give us additional information going forward that would be valuable in understanding the plight of older job applicants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. NEWMAN).

Ms. NEWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the millions of older workers who desperately need our help.

Last year, we saw older Americans leave the workforce more than we ever have before, in fact, more than in the last seven decades.

We are seeing tens of thousands of workers with the right qualifications

for a job being turned away all because they are 50, maybe even 40, and considered too old. In fact, 76 percent of older American workers reported seeing age discrimination when trying to obtain a job.

Mr. Speaker, 76 percent. That is clearly unacceptable.

We need to pass the Protect Older Job Applicants Act to ensure America's older workers are finally protected from discrimination. But before we can solve that problem, we have to fully understand it.

That is why included in this bill is an amendment I put forth to ensure the Federal Government has the resources it needs to study just how many job applicants have been discriminated against based on age. By doing so, we can better provide recommendations and best practices to further prevent this issue because when we lift up all of our older workers, we lift up our entire economy.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), the cosponsor of the underlying legislation.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Pappas and Newman amendment. This amendment from my colleagues just enhances this bill.

As a former administrative law judge for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the Houston region, I can tell you personally that the type of information that would be gathered by the EEOC on the number of job applicants impacted by age discrimination on the job and all the issues that they have related to their applications would be very helpful.

It would not only be helpful to the administrative law judges at the EEOC; it would be helpful for judges that would finally hear the cases in court if they go to court. It would be helpful for research. It would be helpful for advocacy groups. This information would be vital, again, to help us in Congress to seek better ways to improve and work best on prevention and combating and addressing age discrimination in the hiring process.

Mr. Speaker, there is some discussion on the other side of the aisle that this is a remedy for a problem that doesn't exist. Let me tell you, if you talk to advocacy groups, discrimination is alive and well.

We need this legislation. We need this amendment. I urge adoption.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KELLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part E of House Report 117-137.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 3. DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—Subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the date the Government Accountability Office reports to Congress the results of a study such Office carries out to determine whether not allowing claims of disparate impact discrimination by applicants for employment under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (20 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) has a significant negative impact on such applicants.

(b) **STUDY RESULTS.**—If the results of the study carried out under subsection (a) show there is not a significant negative impact of the kind described in such subsection on applicants for employment, then the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, before considering any legislation, the House should first make a determination about whether the proposal is actually needed and then should always carefully study the pending legislation to determine whether it will adequately and positively address the issue it purports to address. Unfortunately, Democrats have failed on both counts with H.R. 3992.

The bill was introduced only 8 legislative days before the Committee on Education and Labor markup, and the committee did not hold a hearing on the legislation.

As such, we are flying blind as we consider H.R. 3992 today.

H.R. 3992 authorizes disparate impact claims for job applicants under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and it has wide-ranging and damaging implications that need thorough examination.

Significantly, we have had no data on whether excluding job applicants from disparate impact coverage under the ADEA has a significant negative impact on older job applicants. Indeed, to date, there have been zero circuit court decisions ruling that the ADEA authorizes job applicants to sue under a disparate impact theory.

Further, we have no information about the numerous effects this sweeping bill would have on job seekers and businessowners. As we have heard during this debate, H.R. 3992 could needlessly interfere with routine recruitment practices, such as college recruiting, apprenticeship programs, and online job postings.

Given the appalling lack of data on the issue and the rush by Democrats to pass the bill, this amendment simply requires the GAO to conduct a needed study on whether excluding job applicants from disparate impact coverage under the ADEA has a significant negative impact on older job applicants. If the study finds no such negative impact, the bill would not go into effect.

This House should not legislate in the dark. Unfortunately, this is exactly what we are doing here today.

This amendment will shed some much-needed light on a far-reaching bill that has not received proper examination.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, let me say again for the third time that, in fact, the committee did have a hearing on this subject. On March 18, 2021, the Subcommittees on Civil Rights and Human Services and Workforce Protections held a hearing titled “Fighting for Fairness: Examining Legislation to Confront Workplace Discrimination.”

At that hearing, Laurie McCann, a senior attorney at AARP Foundation, testified about the erosion of protections for older workers in judicial decisions under the ADA, including specific mention in her testimony of the Seventh Circuit’s Kleber decision and its harmful impact on older applicants.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment prevents the legislation from going into effect unless the GAO finds that there have been negative impacts. This is simply a delay tactic with no end date in sight.

The reason we are here today is precisely because we do have a problem due to the circuit court decisions which cut off access to the courts for job applicants seeking relief under the ADEA.

□ 1730

The Supreme Court has denied cert to review this matter.

We have heard from AARP, one of the Nation’s preeminent authorities on age discrimination, which has advised Congress that these court decisions in the 7th and 11th Circuits are not only at odds with the intent of the ADEA, but that the courthouse doors have been unfairly slammed shut to deserving individuals seeking relief.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services earlier this year noted that barring older applicants from seeking relief for disparate impact discrimination is a problem, and that without clarifying the ADEA, similar plaintiffs will not be able to seek justice under the law.

For example, in the 7th Circuit case, *Kleber v. CareFusion Corporation*, Mr. Kleber, a 58-year-old attorney with considerable corporate law experience

applied for an in-house counsel position.

The position required applicants to have no more than 7 years of relevant legal experience, which effectively means that it freezes out job applicants that were over age 40. Again, on its face it may look neutral, but if you say, “no one with more than 7 years’ experience,” that cuts out a lot of people.

Despite his significant prior experience in corporate law, Kleber was denied the opportunity to even interview for the job, since the experience limit was effectively a proxy for age.

The 7th Circuit held that because Mr. Kleber was an outside job applicant rather than an employee seeking a new position from within the company, he was barred from bringing a disparate impact claim. This turns the entire purpose of the ADEA on its head, which is to remedy age discrimination for both jobseekers and employees. Furthermore, we know generalized age discrimination is not isolated.

In 2017, researchers for the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco sent 40,000 resumes of applicants of all ages to 13,000 job openings across 12 cities. They found that older workers received substantially fewer callbacks from employers for job interviews and showed particular harm for older women applicants.

We do not need another study to tell us what we already know. Older job applicants are subjected to age discrimination when seeking employment and that an effective remedy is needed when that conduct lacks justification.

Madam Speaker, finally, this amendment would indefinitely delay implementation of this bill because there is no deadline for GAO to conduct a study and report back to Congress.

Would we even see the results of this study and when? Again, this is simply a delay tactic. We already have all the evidence we need to know that it is timely for Congress to act and to pass this legislation to protect our older job applicants.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment and “yes” on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I heard my colleague from Texas say that they have had a hearing on the subject. Well, our contention is not the subject, but the bill. There have been zero hearings on this bill, which was introduced 8 legislative days ago.

So I don’t know why there is a rush to judgment on whether we should vote on this or not without making sure we understand all the issues. And since the Democrats are unwilling to do that, this amendment makes perfect sense, if you don’t want to examine it and do that beforehand and do the proper work up front. Let’s make sure before this takes effect and could harm older Americans or job creators, we should understand the impacts and what it means.

So you can sit here and correct the RECORD all you want. What you think you are doing when you talk about the subject, we are talking about the legislation. And we need to know exactly what this legislation is going to do and how it is going to impact older Americans and our job creators.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BOURDEAUX). Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appear to have it.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration on H.R. 3992 is postponed.

BUILD BACK BETTER NOW

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to be able to really inform the American people and to let my friends on the other side of the aisle know what they are missing out on. And that is the greatest effort to improve the quality of life of Americans and raise their economic level of living since Social Security under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, since the Great Society under Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Working moms having the ability to not pay more than 7 percent of their income to get childcare. Young—just beginning school, three years old and four years old—and not one three- or four-year-old being left out of pre-K. Giving them the intellectual stairstep to make a difference in their lives.

And in the State of Texas—the poster child for the uninsured—oh, my goodness, how we have suffered: 766,000 uninsured refuse to take the expanded Medicaid. And now we have the ability to give every person healthcare. And when I spoke to a group that was supported by the American Heart Association, they applauded.

Build back better is what we need to do and we need to do it now and pass both bills, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill—changing lives in America.

NATIONALIZED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, one of the many concerning provisions in the Democrat's reconciliation bill is nationalization of our elementary schools.

The new childcare provisions drastically expand Federal oversight of schools, allowing the Biden administration to determine the education standards for three- to four-year-olds, and places no limit on what additional requirements Democrats can impose upon each States' primary education system.

This bill also delegitimizes family and faith-based education, by limiting funded preschool options to only facilities which teach curriculum that the Biden administration approves of.

The Secretary of Education recently told Congress that parents were not "the primary stakeholder" in "determining educational programming." Really? This means Democrats believe government knows better than what parents think is right for their children.

Allowing the nationalization of elementary schools will further politicize what our kids are being taught, such as divisive ideologies, like critical race theory, or exposed to very inappropriate instructional materials that I can't speak of here.

Madam Speaker, I cannot support a bill that would hand over more of our powers to the government, in an era where too many freedoms have already been relinquished.

DEMOCRATS NATIONALIZE EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, last month the chair of the House Budget Committee, a member of Democratic leadership, told me during an education committee meeting that parents don't know what is best for their children. He said, "We need to protect kids from their parents."

Last night, in some of the bluest parts of our country, parents disagreed. Last night was a resounding victory for parental rights and the future of our country. Parents are fed up—where I am from, we say riled up. They bravely stood up against the Marxist ideology that has taken over the radical left.

Parents rejected racist critical race theory, teaching children that they are

victims. They rejected a perverted sexualized curriculum forced upon young children. Parts of this curriculum are so perverted that if you actually talked about it on the airwaves, you would be fined for indecency. Yet, this is what is included in some of our elementary education curriculum. And they rejected a transgender political agenda that puts young girls in danger in a girls' restroom and will be the end of girls' athletics.

In addition, they are being taught to hate our country, the land of freedom and opportunity. We want our children to be smart, to master the core subjects, and to love our neighbors and our country. Last night was only the beginning—a revolution of regular people. Never estimate the power of regular people to defend their country and their children and their freedom. American values will always defeat Marxist ideology.

The message from parents is loud and clear: Don't mess with our kids.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD.)

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MILLER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our Nation's students are the future. They are our future police officers, doctors, technicians, and manufacturers. And to accomplish this, students will need localized education that is sensitive to the thoughts and concerns of students, parents, and teachers. That is the system we have had in the United States of America for many years.

But lo and behold, inside this multi-trillion-dollar infrastructure budget reconciliation package that is being crafted right now, as we stand here this evening, there are plans—and I don't want to blow this out of proportion—to nationalize and radicalize our Nation's education system.

The Washington takeover of education would give the Biden administration unprecedented levels of Federal oversight and the ability to approve early education standards and provide childcare to wealthy families while pushing small providers out of the market.

This proposal comes at a time when across the country parents are already feeling a little bit cast aside or excluded from some of the major decisions that are being made in their children's education.

Students are being taught divisive and harmful curriculum. The one that is obviously at the forefront is CRT. When parents come to their local school board meetings to express their concerns, they have been met with hostility, and in some cases—extreme cases—they arrested a parent. It is crazy.

This is especially important for parents in Wisconsin, my home State. Parents are fed up with the bureaucracy telling them they—not the parents—know better. And when parents ask

what their children are being taught, they often get a very limited and unsatisfactory response.

So I came up, along with some of my colleagues, with a bill that we thought made sense; very easy, common sunshine-type of bill that ultimately would resolve many of these issues. We call it the CRT Transparency Act.

Madam Speaker, the bill requires schools to post their curriculums online so that parents can see what their students are being taught. Seems simple to me. Just post it online. You have got nothing to hide. It gives the parents the opportunity to see exactly what their children are being taught.

□ 1745

The merits of this bill, I think, would ultimately warrant no controversy. The bill doesn't ask school boards to make private information public. Elementary and secondary curriculums are already public information. The parents who wish to call their school districts and inquire can do that. The problem is, the onus should not be on the parents to jump through hoops to get this information. No matter what the class may be, the bottom line is that the parents have the right to easily access this information.

If schools aren't teaching divisive and backward curriculum, then there should be absolutely no reason not to make this information public. I have spoken to local education leaders back in southeastern Wisconsin, the Fifth Congressional District, who agree with the commonsense sentiment behind the proposals. Unfortunately, I think that President Biden, the Secretary of Education, and the Democrats don't agree, necessarily, with the parents having that much input. They certainly believe that they could bring influence to that entire educational system, which is not something they want.

That is why the attorney general issued a memo instructing the Justice Department to investigate parents speaking up at the local school boards. This is wrong. Despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may believe, parents do have the right to speak up at school board meetings and complain and be vocal about what their children are being taught. In fact, this is the hallmark of being a good parent, right? You just don't want to send your kid off to class and not be involved in what they are involved in every day.

What we saw in Virginia last night sent an undeniably clear message. Those who embrace radical education policies and box out our parents do not represent what the American people want.

My colleagues across the aisle want you to believe that they prioritize students and education, but the text of this budget reconciliation will tell a very different narrative. A narrative that expands the Federal Government's role in education at the expense of good parenting and student outcomes.

I, and I think my Republican colleagues, will oppose any proposal that puts the bureaucracy before students.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, last night was a great night for America. As Virginians across the Commonwealth, in bipartisan fashion, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, rejected the radical, woke, socialist education policies of this Biden administration and this complicit Democrat majority in this Congress.

Most of our schools will be better off being governed by the first seven ticked-off parents in line at the next school board meeting than the woke leftist, progressive, liberal members of the typical American school board.

The Federal Government should not be involved in education. There is no constitutional basis for the Federal Government to be involved in education to begin with. I love our friend, THOMAS MASSIE, our colleague from Kentucky's bill that says—of which I am a cosponsor—the Department of Education shall cease to exist on December 31 of 2022. How much better our schools, our children, our parents, and families would be if that were the case.

We are seeing the silver lining from the past 2 years with the China virus as the exposure has been there. What is being taught in the schools? The strong disinfectant of sunlight, letting parents see what their children are being taught as they supervise them learning from home.

And, thankfully, thousands and thousands of parents showing up at school board meetings to make their voices heard because they don't want critical race theory and its ideology taught in our schools. It is amazing how the Democrat majority and their allies, their friends in the media say: That doesn't exist.

It may be true that there isn't a class taught in a typical American high school that is called critical race theory, taught an hour a day every day for 5 days a week. Of course, that is not true. That is not typical. However, all throughout our country, critical race ideology, this theory that tries to define who we are as Americans: it tries to define Americans based on race; it tries to explain why we became a Nation; it tries to explain why the American Revolution was fought; it tries to identify who are victims and who are oppressors.

That ideology is absolutely included in training for teachers all across this country. In fact, in just the last 2 weeks we have learned that in two of Virginia's largest blue counties, Fairfax County and Loudoun County, teachers are being trained with critical race ideology to have that permeate all of their teaching through all of their classes. It is the lens through which they are taught to present the material to their students.

In Fairfax County, as a matter of fact, it was shown with a recent article

by the Washington Times, spent \$5.5 million dollars in the past year purchasing CRT-related curriculum and materials for their school system. \$2.5 million of which was for—guess whose son in-law's company—the attorney general, Merrick Garland.

So you have parents rising up saying this is not what we want taught in our schools. Not to mention, these radical transgender policies that infringe upon the rights of the 99.9 percent of students who just want to use the bathroom of their choice with people of their own biological gender.

In Loudoun County, a county that has become notorious around the country because of this, we have a county where they have a male student who goes into the women's restroom and commits sexual assault. It was not exposed as it should have been and dealt with as it should have been. He transferred to another school where another assault takes place.

After that occurs, the parent of the first student victim shows up at a school board meeting, understandably upset, surprisingly restrained from how upset a parent must be. What did we do? We arrest the parent at the school board meeting.

After both of those assaults took place, that very school board passes their official transgender policy allowing male students who want to identify as female students to access those restrooms.

In addition, throughout the country, we are making children, who now we want to vaccinate, they are almost no risk from the China virus, but we are making these children wear masks all day long despite there being almost no evidence that it makes any measurable difference for anyone to wear a mask. To do that to children all day long in a school is nothing short of child abuse.

For this and many other reasons, Virginians across the Commonwealth rose up and said no to that and elected a Governor, a Lieutenant Governor, an attorney general, and a new Virginia House of Delegates that will say no to the radical views of the majority Democrat Party today in Virginia, that is aligned with the radical views on education and otherwise, here in this Chamber and in this town and in this administration.

When I ran for office 2 years ago, I identified immigration, our fiscal situation and our spending, and education as the three most critical issues, the greatest threats to the future of our country. Our children are our most precious resource and they are truly our future. Our children's education is the one thing where those who hold all the levers of power here in Washington and—at least until January—in my home State of Virginia, they tell us: You must pay for it with compulsory taxes, but you have no say in that product that you are purchasing. In fact, the losing—thank God—the losing gubernatorial candidate in Virginia

who was resoundingly rejected, who tried to nationalize the election by bringing in all the heavy-hitters, the former President, the current President, the current Vice President, the losing candidate said: Parents, you got no say. It is none of your business. Give us your money. We will teach your kids. We will decide what they learn. We will decide the policies. If you show up to the school board systems, what we will do is identify you as a domestic terrorist and we will sic the FBI and the attorney general on you. Americans and Virginians said no. They also said no in New Jersey. And they are going to say no throughout this country next year.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time and effort by my colleague from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), for leading the charge on this.

So what are we looking at here? Parents, their kids, they have the perfect right to know what is going on in the schools and what the kids will be subject to during those seven or so hours per day that we entrust that system with our kids. Indeed, this is a covenant we have had for many, many years.

Parents and families with the school system, with the government, that they are going to do the things and teach our kids and treat our kids in a way that we approve as parents during those hours a day in those formative years, all those hours they have together that they are not under our direct watch or supervision.

So what is this all about? The direction it is going right now is indeed very disturbing. As we saw last night just across the river over in Virginia, an issue has been brought to a head by two different Governor candidates, and a lot of people going before that, to express their views in a First Amendment fashion to their school boards that they elect to do the job for them.

Over here in Virginia we saw a real ground swell of things that we will be seeing a lot more of across this country. Indeed, we are seeing it in my own district at home. People saying no to what is being forced upon them in my own State by our Governor and a lot of health systems on the vaccine mandate for vaccines that are really unproven still for kids.

In information that I saw today, it says the down-sized vaccine for 5- to 11-year-olds probably doesn't really prevent anything, but it just may lessen their symptoms if they get the virus. Well, maybe parents would like to opt out of that. Maybe that is not something that is good enough for their kids given the offsetting possible risks. It comes back to: Whose kids are they?

Going back to simpler and earlier times when the first settlers of this country came across and were settling in the West, and as the first rough-necks and those went and set up min-

ing and cattle and settling in the West. Settling this Nation. They would then send for people to operate their schools as they got married and started families. A lot of one-room schoolhouses. I know that is not what we have right now, and, oh, he is getting all nostalgic and all that stuff. No.

Could you imagine that those pioneers would put up with the idea that you are not allowed to know what is going on in your school. You are not allowed to know the curriculum. You are not allowed to know what school activities are going on, or the medical or health issues that your kids are going through. Can you imagine that back then? Can you imagine those pioneers, those settlers, those early colonials, even just 50 years ago, can you imagine they would put up with that?

We have been lulled to sleep by allowing the system to do what it does. Well, people are speaking out, they are fighting back, and saying, no, we are not putting up with this anymore because the education system has gotten away from them.

We have seen it. We saw it at the school board meetings in Virginia, and we see it all over the country. I am seeing it my district in northern California. They are going to these meetings and demanding to know what it is you are teaching them.

As my colleague, Representative MILLER, mentioned a little bit ago, it is amazing to watch when the parents—which really takes some guts—stand up publicly and read back to the board some of the content that they are finding in the books that are in the library or even in direct curriculum, with the explicit sexual nature of what is being said and taught to kids at a very young age.

□ 1800

It is outrageous, and it makes everybody in the audience uncomfortable, what is being read off there. My hat is off to those moms and dads who are standing there in public reading these pretty ugly things to the board so they have to face it and so they have to deal with it.

That is putting the spotlight on what this is for many, many people around the country. It is getting people off the sidelines and out of their busy lives. I know it is tough. A lot of families have to do two jobs because of high taxes and all the other demands on them these days, but we have to come off the sidelines.

We are seeing more and more people making different choices for their kids in schools such as charter schools and private schools, whatever it is, because they want the best for their kid.

When you see a homeschool family, a charter school family, or private school parents doing that, they are extra dedicated because they have to make an extra sacrifice to make sure their kids are getting a good education.

And what do we get in this society here of public education?

They make fun of those people. They say: Oh, those kids are awkward, and they don't fit in.

They are some of the best-educated kids you have, Madam Speaker, and they are the ones who are moving forward to be in leadership versus the ones who are not given a school choice to break out of a bad situation.

Especially in our urban areas, wouldn't these inner-city families like to have choices sometimes to alternative education instead of the same thing from the same old standards?

So we are seeing people pushing back, fighting back, and demanding to be heard because your children do not belong to the government. They do not belong to the school system. They belong to you, given to you by God, and they are your responsibility.

So you have every right to have your voice heard, not to be called a terrorist and not to be monitored by the FBI or the Attorney General whose family might be making money off of this or somebody else.

You have every right to speak out. So do not be cowered by the left, by the media, and by the big school system that is trying to cower you into not being a part of it.

You move forward, and you be strong. You demand to know and demand to ask better for your children because they are yours. They do not belong to the government or any education system that is supposed to be working for all of us.

So I appreciate this Special Order hour tonight.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I do have to say that this is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is an issue that affects all American children.

But where are the Democrat leaders? Why are they not speaking out on this?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MILLER for her leadership on this vital issue of protecting education.

In their quest for absolute power, Democrats are not just stopping with doubling the size of the IRS to target Americans, granting mass amnesty for millions of illegal migrants, or imposing burdensome tax hikes on workers and small businesses. No. They also plan to nationalize early education.

The Democrats' \$1.75 trillion Big Government socialist spending bill aims to strip parents of their freedom and hand over more power to bureaucrats and politicians in Washington. Under this irresponsible spending package, the Biden administration obtains total control in approving early childhood education standards while limiting parents' choice in their children's education.

Mark my words, Madam Speaker. The Democrats' reckless reconciliation bill is a shameless ruse to indoctrinate America's youth with divisive curriculum and radical ideas. It is no coincidence that this comes at a time when

the Department of Justice is targeting parents—yes, targeting parents—for exercising their First Amendment rights to speak out against critical race theory curriculum and unscientific mask mandates in schools. No wonder parents across the country are fed up with this nonsense.

Parents are the primary stakeholders in their children's education. It is not the radical left; it is not the Federal Government; and it is not the failed teachers unions. It is parents.

By injecting woke political propaganda into our schools instead of focusing on beneficial subjects such as history, reading, writing, and arithmetic, Democrats are holding children back from a top-tier education.

Additionally, through the Democrats' empty promise guise of affordable childcare, this legislation would actually drive childcare prices through the roof, forcing middle-class families to spend roughly \$13,000 more per year.

Simply put, the Democrats' Big Government, socialist bill has the Federal Government's fingerprints all over education, which is not in accordance with the Constitution, and that should terrify every parent across the country.

This is one of the many reasons why we need to preserve school and parental choice at the local level. It will ensure every solitary student has the opportunity to receive an education that will adequately prepare them for the future and that every solitary parent has the choice to decide where their children receive that education.

Madam Speaker, let's empower parents and not embolden the Federal Government.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN).

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Congresswoman MILLER's efforts and leadership on this critical and vital topic.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of the God-given right of parents to guide and shape the education of their children. Preparing our children for the world and teaching them the skills they need to be successful adults is not only a parent's right; it is also their responsibility. Unfortunately, it is one of many of our sacred rights that my Democrat colleagues want to rip away and give to the Federal Government.

Having already corrupted our higher education system with anti-American ideology, Democrats are now pushing their indoctrination program down to K-12. This may sound like partisan rhetoric, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are hiding their intentions.

Their build back broke plan includes a \$10 billion environmental justice slush fund that will be used to push the Green New Deal in universities. They are incorporating divisive, racist ideologies like critical race theory into classrooms across the country.

They will try to say that is not true. But don't buy their lie. Regardless of

what you name it, Madam Speaker, any curriculum that teaches kids that they are inherently racist or hopelessly victims simply because of the color of their skin is itself racist. It runs counter to the American ideal. That is not freedom of ideas. That is indoctrination.

They are working actively to push parents out of every aspect of their children's education.

Don't believe it.

In Loudoun County, Virginia, just across the river here, any parent wanting to review the CRT components of the curriculum is required to sign a nondisclosure agreement, a legally binding document that forbids them from sharing what they find out.

What is it in their curriculum that they don't want people to find out about it?

And once they find out about it, why don't they want it to be shared?

I come from Florida, a State where we value transparency and the sunshine. We have very strict sunshine laws. This would never fly in the State of Florida. We are not afraid of what our government is doing there. In fact, we want people to know more about it.

The COVID pandemic and our country's response to it will have long-lasting effects on our Nation. Perhaps one of the most destructive of these aspects is the developmental damage inflicted on our children because their needs were placed last.

If there is any silver lining at all to the pandemic, it is that parents whose children were subjected to school shutdowns were finally able to experience firsthand what they are being taught. They responded with anger and frustration at the politicians who have allowed this travesty to occur.

Unfortunately, the Democrat response to this nationwide movement has been to treat concerned parents as domestic terrorists, and they have weaponized the Justice Department in an effort to get these parents to sit down and shut up.

Terry McAuliffe's statement that he doesn't believe parents should tell schools what to teach was a horrifying peer into the soul of what radical progressives truly believe, that Big Brother, the Federal Government, knows best and should be given full autonomy to control our lives.

But Virginians put the Democrats on notice last night. America rejects their efforts to ram through a toxic platform of cradle-to-grave government dependence. This doesn't just include Federal overreach in our education system but also in the outrageous spending programs that will destroy our economic prosperity.

Democrats are trying to sell Americans a bill of goods they don't want, they can't afford, and with money the country doesn't have.

During election years, we often ask the American people how they are doing compared to 4 years ago. I would ask them now: How are you doing compared to 10 months ago?

Our education system is falling apart, our southern border is a disaster, violent crime has skyrocketed across the country, our botched withdrawal from Afghanistan has diminished our standing on the world stage, and inflation is running rampant. Every action the Biden administration takes is hurting our country. Americans know they are worse off, but Democrats appear to be unaware or apathetic.

As I look across the aisle, where are the traditional liberals?

If you are still there, it is time to come out of hiding and stand up to the radical progressives who are destroying the very fabric of the country I know you love. Stop listening to the D.C. and big city echo chambers. Those are not the voice of America.

Show the American people that you are listening to them by standing against divisive rhetoric in our schools, stopping outrageous government spending, and supporting law and order. Yesterday's election should serve as a wake-up call to all who wish to save America from destruction. It is not too late.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Governor of Florida for the great example he has been to the rest of the States and how he is leading the way in education. We appreciate it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity.

Madam Speaker, it is time to put our kids first in education. Far-left Democrats who want the government and teachers unions in charge of what children are taught have been working overtime to strip parents of their rights. Within their boondoggle tax-and-spend agenda, Democrats have slipped in a quiet government takeover of our schools. Ultimately, this would ensure Washington bureaucrats and teachers unions have a larger influence on shaping a child's upbringing than their parents.

Under the Democrats' monstrous multitrillion-dollar socialist spending bill is a provision that creates universal daycare and preschool and would allow the government to decide what children are taught, where they will spend their time, and who can teach and care for them.

This is simply wrong. It is not fair, and it violates the trust we put in our schools.

When it comes to their children's education, parents and families deserve more control, not less. We have already seen what government-controlled education looks like as government-run public schools fail to teach children basic skills.

Worse, Democrats are using the public education system to push leftwing ideologies and divisive curricula like critical race theory and the historically inaccurate 1619 Project, which do

nothing but pollute the minds of our young children.

Parents and families deserve schools they can trust. As one of the Representatives for Tennessee and as the father of two young children, I am working to put power back into the hands of parents, families, and local school leaders.

Let's make student welfare and traditional education the only special interest we fund and promote when it comes to our children's schools, not leftwing efforts to turn schools into far left, ideological indoctrination centers.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. To conclude, Madam Speaker, I want to say that we want our children to be smart; we want them to master the core subjects; and we want them to love their neighbor and their country.

Please do not underestimate the power of regular people to defend their children and their country.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

TOXIC MILITARY BURN PITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of my constituent, Jennifer Kepner and to call for immediate action on the most pressing public health issue facing our veterans: toxic military burn pits.

Four years ago, I met a veteran named Jennifer Kepner at her home in Cathedral City, California, in my district. Jennifer, a 39-year-old mother of two, was one of the most inspiring and brave people I have ever met, and that kitchen table conversation was one of the most impactful conversations in my life.

When I met her, she was cachectic. You could see her bones. She was wasting away. She was battling pancreatic cancer and was on chemotherapy. You could see the port in her chest and you could see the loss of hair. And she was still so very full of energy inside to tell her story and sound the alarm.

Her doctor linked her exposure to burn pits during her service overseas. You see, she was described as a health nut, as someone thin, healthy, who liked to run, and jog. Her friends would say: She was one of those crazy people who would wake up at 4 in the morning and go on a 5-mile run routinely.

So when she came down with pancreatic cancer at such a young age, her physicians looked at her DNA, her family history, and they concluded that the most likely cause, given her low risk, was her exposure to toxic military burn pit smoke.

I sat with her in her home as she told me her story. She told me about her military service as an Air Force medic caring for our men and women in uniform who were injured or sick. You see, she was stationed at Balad Air Base in Iraq. She told me about her husband and their two children, Adia and Wyatt, who she loved so very dearly.

She told me about burn pits, these huge fields where the military burns trash—anything and everything—including batteries, jet fuel, medical waste, plastics, and other hazardous material causing servicemembers to inhale toxic chemicals, carcinogens, and particulate matter.

They call it the crud, you see, because after a long day in the desert serving our country, they go to their camp wanting a little rest, and they smell this black toxic chemical smoke and they get the soot on their face, in their nostrils, in their throat. They have itchy eyes, a runny nose, a sore throat. They cough, and that is just another day at a base serving our country.

Jennifer spent her last month as a leading voice for her fellow veterans exposed to burn pits which she called “the Agent Orange of our generation.”

Wow. “The Agent Orange of our generation.” We all are infuriated with the way that our Vietnam veterans were denied and their care was delayed and their recognition had been postponed when they were saying, “We are sick.” Their children are born malformed. They are infertile. They have other issues and syndromes and symptoms that are life-threatening and debilitating.

She is saying that this is the Agent Orange of our generation, and she knew that she was going to die. She knew that her days were limited. She knew that pancreatic cancer is the most aggressive cancer that causes death within months after diagnosis.

She didn't give up. She didn't give up, despite the VA denying her the recognition that it was the burn pits that caused her pancreatic cancer. She didn't give up. Despite the VA denying her the benefits that she needed for her family, she didn't give up. Her dying wish was to ensure two things: one, was that other veterans didn't have to struggle through a system that denied and delayed and did not recognize her illness so that she said: Let's help other veterans.

The second was: Please help my husband, Ben, get the benefits to care for my children. In her last dying days she was thinking of others with that heart of a servant and the fierce determination of a warrior.

I remember getting the call when I was in my district office that she was

dying, and she would potentially die within a few hours.

I fell to my knees and I cried. I composed myself and I thought, as a physician, there are only certain things that I can do in the art and science of medicine, but I know that there is a greater healer; that there is a greater power, and perhaps this is what I can bring to serve the family at this moment. So I invited my pastor, Gerald Sharon, to come with me so that we could pray with her on her deathbed.

There she was, taking her last breaths. Her mother was there crying. Her husband was trying to keep it together. Her children were at her side. The youngest one was too young to understand what was happening. The older one, the daughter, was a little more aware, but she was trying to keep it together.

We did our prayer, and she died on October 18, 2017. Since then, it has been my mission to make her vision a reality.

Her story drove me to found the bipartisan, bicameral Congressional Burn Pits Caucus with my friend and colleague Congressman BRAD WENSTRUP from Ohio.

Her story inspired me to work with brilliant minds across the aisle like my friend who is sitting here, Representative GUS BILIRAKIS, to introduce legislation in a bipartisan manner.

And her strength inspired me to co-author my bipartisan, bicameral legislation, the Presumptive Benefits for War Fighters Exposed to Burn Pits and Other Toxins Act, to get veterans the benefits and care they have earned and need and deserve.

Her vision is reflected in the Honoring Our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxins Act, or the Honoring Our PACT Act, which includes my legislation to keep our Nation's promise to our veterans to take care of them after they serve our Nation.

Her stories and the countless stories of other veterans that you will hear today by Republicans and Democrats are speaking to us beyond the grave to act now with urgency for their fellow veterans and for their families. Under the leadership of our great chairman of the VA Committee, Chair MARK TAKANO, we will get this done.

We cannot sit by while the veterans Jennifer served with are denied the healthcare and benefits they have earned and deserve. No one who has served and sacrificed for our Nation should have to face the trials that she endured to get the medical care that she needed, or their widows the benefits to support their families with a life of dignity.

In 1 week, we will celebrate Veterans Day and show our appreciation for all of those who served our Nation in our Armed Forces. Some will wear red, white, and blue attire. Some will even go as far as to make public displays of hugging a flag, and some will always say the same old thing: Thank you to our veterans. Thank you to our veterans for your service.

I have said consistently that our veterans appreciate the thanks but they really need pragmatic support.

On Memorial Day, the way we memorialize and honor the dead is by serving the living and improving their lives.

They might have survived the battlefield, but they are dying from their exposures of a self-inflicted Department of Defense wound to our men and women in uniform by using these burn pits that, by the way, are illegal and banned in the United States precisely for their public health hazards.

We need pragmatic support, not lip service or empty gestures in our appreciation and celebration on Veterans Day. We must act now and get our veterans the healthcare and benefits they have earned when we sent them to war for our country.

Servicemembers are returning home from the battlefield right now only to become delayed casualties of war, dying years later from constrictive bronchiolitis, pulmonary fibrosis, brain cancer, breast cancer, pancreatic cancer, gastric cancers, and autoimmune diseases caused by their exposure to the toxic, hundreds of chemicals from burned plastics, jet fuels, and hazardous materials that they inhaled while serving our Nation.

The DOD and the VA cannot continue to neglect this self-inflicted wound on our veterans. So in Jennifer's name and the countless names of the veterans who have suffered and some succumbed to their illnesses due to their exposures to burn pits, we all will continue fighting tooth and nail to protect our servicemembers and our veterans from toxic burn pits.

She would never turn her back on a fellow veteran, and as a nation, neither can we.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), my friend, my neighbor, and the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, a true champion for our veterans and the sponsor of Honoring our PACT Act.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank my neighbor and very good friend, Dr. RAUL RUIZ, for holding and hosting this Special Order hour on toxic exposures.

Madam Speaker, tonight I rise to talk about the urgent need to finally recognize toxic exposure as a cost of war and pass the Honoring Our PACT Act.

Every day I hear from more and more veterans who have been exposed to toxic substances while serving our Nation. Whether it is exposure to burn pits, contaminated water, radiation, or other toxins, the health effects are often severe from chronic multisymptom illnesses, to cancers, birth defects, infertility, and respiratory conditions.

This problem isn't new, and neither is the need for congressional intervention. As chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was proud to lead the effort last Congress to pass the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act and get long-overdue jus-

tice for our Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange. But that took more than 40 years. We cannot let our post-9/11 veterans suffer the same fate. And, yes, we are in danger of having burn pits become this generation of veterans' Agent Orange.

We cannot allow this generation of veterans to go the 40 years that our Vietnam veterans had to wait for their justice.

□ 1830

When we send our servicemembers into harm's way, we do so with a promise to care for them and pay for that care. We haven't been keeping up our end of the deal. Hundreds of thousands of veterans have signed up for VA's burn pit registry. However, with 70 percent of burn pit claims denied, it is clear that VA's current claims process isn't working. No veteran should be forced to prove that their government exposed them to toxic substances. The Honoring our PACT Act fixes that and finally makes good on our promise.

With our bipartisan legislation, we can deliver VA benefits and care to up to 3.5 million veterans exposed to burn pits and airborne hazards. We can establish a presumption of service connection for 23 respiratory illnesses and cancers, the most comprehensive list out there. Additionally, we can streamline VA's review process for toxic exposure presumptions, so Congress doesn't have to keep intervening.

With the exit from Afghanistan still fresh in our minds, we cannot forget that the true cost of war is so much more than the tanks, planes, and weapons used on the battlefield. Veterans living with toxic exposure are still in the heat of battle, and they are paying for the cost of war that our Nation should be paying. That is why we need to pass the Honoring our PACT Act into law. With 60 cosponsors, bipartisan support, endorsements from nine veteran services organizations, and a VA Secretary and President who are committed to addressing this issue, we have the momentum to get this done.

With every day that passes, more veterans get sick and, sadly, die waiting for the care and benefits they have earned. We must act now. I want to thank Dr. RUIZ and the Congressional Burn Pits Caucus for partnering with my committee to share the stories of toxic-exposed veterans today and showcase how transformative passing the Honoring our PACT Act will be.

With Veterans Day right around the corner, we can honor our veterans' service with action. I urge all Members to consider sponsoring our legislation.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), my friend, who is a member of the Congressional Burn Pits Caucus.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman RUIZ for organizing this Special Order.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Marine Corporal William Garza, Jr.

William joined the Marines in the summer before 9/11. His first deployment was to Iraq in 2003, where he participated in the fall of Baghdad. It was there, during war, where he was exposed to burn pits.

When I met William, he told me that he and his fellow marines would sleep and work around burn pits 24/7. These burn pits were as big as football fields, burning tires, human waste, metals, and electronics. William, like many servicemembers, didn't know the dangers of burn pit exposure.

After serving his country with honor, he returned home to Texas, and he soon met the love of his life, Melanie, and they would marry, buy a home, and start living their American Dream.

Soon after his marriage, William developed a sore on his tongue, but he struggled to get an appointment with the VA. When he did, it confirmed his worst fear: cancer.

He would receive treatment at Brooke Army Medical Center, where the doctors would perform a miracle throat cancer treatment. William beat cancer.

Then, a few years later, he received terrible news during a VA checkup. He had two tumors in his lungs, and he would need immediate treatment.

But then, making matters worse, he received a letter from the VA denying his service-connected disability claim. This time around the chemo and immunotherapy would not be as successful, and his cancer spread. On March 4, 2019, in San Antonio, Texas, William died, and our Nation lost a hero.

His mother, Rose, who I had the pleasure of speaking with, calls him "William, my Hero."

Marine Corporal William Garza, Jr., deserved better.

I hope William's story creates an urgency in Congress to address this generation's Agent Orange.

Burn pits have destroyed servicemembers' lives and American families. Let's not let another veteran receive a denial of benefits letter. Let's work together to honor our Nation's sacred obligation to our men and women in uniform.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), my friend and colleague, a member of the Congressional Burn Pits Caucus, and a fierce advocate for our veterans.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Dr. RUIZ, for organizing this very important Special Order. I know he is a terrific doctor, and the fact that he has sacrificed to be here, to complete the mission. I appreciate it so very much. I have a similar story as well, but we must complete this mission as soon as possible. As Jennifer said, this is the Agent Orange of our era.

Providing the care and support for our veterans, our Nation's heroes, has been one of my top priorities since I was elected to Congress, and I will continue to fight to ensure that our veterans get the benefits they deserve.

As a matter of fact, after one of our hearings a few years ago on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we had many veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange. Their families were present with them, their children were present with them, and I invited them into my office. One-on-one, they told me the stories of what happened. The spouses would tell me: my husband, my wife, was exposed, and now he or she can't work. Who is going to support the family? What is going to happen to these children if their father or mother passes away? Who is going to take care of them? They need healthcare now. They need their benefits now.

We can't wait any longer, Madam Speaker. Burn pits are the Agent Orange of our era, as Jennifer said. And the fact that we haven't resolved the issue of burn pit exposure is an absolute disservice to our veterans. They were exposed, and we must help them.

I have fought for over multiple Congresses, with my colleague Dr. RUIZ and my colleague BRAD WENSTRUP from the great State of Ohio, leading and sponsoring numerous pieces of legislation to get toxic-exposed veterans the treatment and benefits they deserve, because many cannot afford to wait any longer.

Tragically, one of our veterans came to me a few years ago, Lauren Price. Similar to Dr. RUIZ and Jennifer, we made it our mission to get this done. During Lauren's service to our country, she was exposed to burn pits. This past spring, she sadly passed away due to an illness linked to her burn pit exposure, but not before taking up the cause for her fellow veterans to make sure they or their families would not have to experience the same suffering she and her family experienced. Lauren knew that she was going to pass away, but she wanted to make it better for her fellow veterans. Her goal was to pass this legislation and similar legislation that Dr. RUIZ and I have cosponsored over the years.

I was incredibly moved to see her husband and my good friend, Jim Price, continue this tireless advocacy by testifying as a witness before the Veterans' Affairs Committee just this past year in support of the TEAM Act, which would comprehensively address toxic exposures now and in the future.

This critical bill adopts provisions for my legislation that I previously authored, the Protection for Veterans' Burn Pit Exposure Act.

I urge Congress to take up and pass the TEAM Act immediately. If we are going to be spending money, Madam Speaker, let's spend it on our heroes.

I am also proud to co-lead a host of additional burn pit legislative fixes with Dr. RUIZ and urge immediate action in the House and Senate on H.R. 4398, H.R. 4397, H.R. 2432, and H.R. 2371.

While both H.R. 4398 and H.R. 4397 were included in the House version of the NDAA, we must continue pushing until they are across the finish line and signed by the President.

Again, I thank my good friend, Dr. RUIZ, for organizing this Special Order. I can't think of a more worthy cause than providing for these veterans in their time of need, just as they provided for our country when we needed them. Let's get this done for our veterans.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), who I am proud to have join me as a cosponsor of the Honoring our PACT Act and a member of the bipartisan Congressional Burn Pits Caucus.

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his leadership. I want to thank Chairman TAKANO, who has been responsible for really taking care of the veterans. He helped us rename our clinic back in Youngstown after Carl Nunziato, who is a tremendous Vietnam veteran. I also want to thank the gentleman from Cincinnati, my home State, for being a part of all of this and being a leader in all of this. I want to thank him for that.

Madam Speaker, I rise tonight in honor of the memory of Ohio Army Guardsman Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson. I met Heath's daughter, Brielle, a few months back and heard the story of Heath from his mother-in-law, Susan.

These stories, as you have heard tonight, are heartbreaking. Because when you look at Brielle and his wife, Danielle, this is more than just we have got to get something fixed to take care of a veteran who served their country. This is the modern version of Agent Orange.

But this is bringing so much heartbreak to so many families and to so many communities in States like Ohio where we have so many veterans who served their country.

On March 21, 2017, Heath and his wife, Danielle, were sitting in an exam room at Zangmeister Cancer Center in Columbus, Ohio, when Heath was given a terminal diagnosis. He had only 6 weeks to live.

At only 35 years old, Heath was suffering from gushing nosebleeds and bleeding from his ears. Dozens of doctors were unable to provide answers, but they all did have one question: What in the hell have you been exposed to?

It turns out that Heath, a combat medic, had spent every day for 3 months within 15 yards of a massive burn pit at Camp Liberty complex in Iraq.

Heath was afflicted with a rare autoimmune disease that mostly strikes elderly women and an extremely rare form of lung cancer that, according to 20 oncologists, could have only been caused by a prolonged exposure and inhalation of toxic substances.

Madam Speaker, how can we pretend that both the VA and we, as a Nation, do not owe the veterans like Heath and their families both the care and the benefits that they have earned, often with their very lives? This is not who we are as a country.

We have got to fix this in Congress. The time is now. Not next year, not 5 years from now, but now, right now.

Servicemembers like Heath, and countless others, thousands, maybe tens of thousands, spent the last 20 years fighting our Nation's longest war. We cannot turn our backs on them.

I have introduced legislation to help collect the data so that the VA has it and that every 3 months they report to this Congress as to what the data is and what the claims are so we can hold them accountable.

Most importantly, I want to thank Danielle, I want to thank Susan. And I want to let Brielle and Danielle and Susan know, and their family, that there are so many prayers coming to them from this Congress.

But we are going to get it done, and we are going to get it done soon. It is going to be a bipartisan effort with guys like the gentleman from Cincinnati and the gentleman from California and myself. Let's get this thing done.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), the co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Burn Pits Caucus.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, we are here tonight to recognize and bring awareness to our servicemembers who are dealing with health issues caused by exposure to burn pits and other toxins during their tour of duty.

These brave men and women answered the call. They were willing to lay down their lives for our freedom, and they served us honorably.

Unknowningly, by following orders, they put themselves in harm's way.

As our military continues to adapt, we are learning that certain amounts of exposure to burn pits can potentially present troublesome and life-threatening health challenges, some that don't show up until later in life.

When I served in Iraq, I smelled the smoke, and I don't wish it upon anyone. Those suffering from the repercussions of burn pit exposure need help, not hurdles. We must meet them with compassion, not red tape. That is why I am proud to work with fellow members of the Congressional Burn Pit Caucus, as well as friends on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, to put forth bipartisan solutions to help our servicemembers. We must prevent this in the future and care for those that have borne the battle.

I want to thank my friend, Dr. RUIZ, for hosting this Special Order. I am proud to work with him on this issue, as I have been proud to work with him on so many other issues on behalf of patients.

□ 1845

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining? Do I have 1 minute remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, this month, we will pause on November 11th to honor the men and women who have selflessly served America in uniform. Veterans of the United States Armed Forces have dedicated their lives to protecting our nation, and it is critical we express our sincere gratitude for the sacrifices they have made.

I appreciate the opportunity to draw awareness to a critical issue affecting both veterans and current servicemembers—toxic exposure.

Toxic exposure has affected U.S. servicemembers for generations. While each war and conflict has posed unique hazards and health risks for servicemembers, our nation's youngest veterans are increasingly facing health consequences due to exposure to toxic chemicals during their military service in the Middle East.

Over the past two decades in the Middle East, open burn pits were commonly used as disposal sites for materials such as trash, weapons, batteries, and other waste. Servicemembers are concerned about the illnesses that are linked to exposure to the toxic fumes and smoke emitted by these burn pits, especially as some have begun developing rare cancers and illnesses at higher rates than their counterparts that were deployed to other parts of the world.

Michigan-native Kevin Hensley is one such veteran who has been deeply impacted by burn pits. Kevin is a veteran of the U.S. Air Force who was deployed to the Middle East eight times and stationed near open air burn pits during four of his deployments. After retiring and moving back to Wayne County in 2015, Kevin's health began rapidly deteriorating. By 2017, Kevin had been diagnosed with Constrictive Bronchiolitis, and later brain scans revealed serious damage from inhaling toxic smoke.

Kevin struggles with daily tasks, saying he finds it difficult to go grocery shopping without gasping for air. Equally upsetting, Kevin has faced challenges receiving care through the VA. Only in 2020 did the VA formally expand benefits for veterans suffering with illnesses related to exposure to burn pits. Still, veterans must shoulder a burden of proof, which requires them to precisely pinpoint where and when they may have been exposed to burn pits. As a result, the VA continues to deny an overwhelming number of burn-pit related disability claims.

Unfortunately, Kevin's story is one of far too many. Our nation's veterans deserve better, and we must recommit ourselves to this effort to ensure veterans receive the benefits and care they're entitled to.

That's why I'm a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3967, the Honoring Our Promises to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2021. This bipartisan bill will provide vital support to veterans who have been exposed to burn pits and other toxins and ensure they can access crucial healthcare services through the VA.

I thank Rep. RUIZ for his steadfast leadership on toxic exposure and burn pits. I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation and continue pursuing other legislative solutions that will ensure our servicemembers have access to the healthcare they deserve.

DO BETTER FOR VETERANS

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, Vermonters have done their full measure of service throughout our history, and that is true in Iraq and Afghanistan. Two of our great soldiers, Sergeant Major Michael Cram and Brigadier General Michael Heston, both died of cancers that we believe were related to their exposures to burn pits.

Their wonderful widows, Pat Cram and June Heston, have been so vigilant and energetic in putting a focus on the devastation of these burn pits and played a major role in encouraging the VA to, A, get a registry; B, the Defense Department to stop exposing people to burn pits; and then, C, to have us presume that those who have been exposed to burn pits and developed a disease as a result of that are entitled to VA benefits. We must get this done.

AMERICA'S BUDGET WOES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, as we get ourselves sort of organized, last Monday, I did an entire hour here on the floor—55 minutes—and we actually did a presentation up and down the budget. Not this budget cycle, but basically what does our country look like over the next 30 years? What is driving the projections of \$112 trillion of debt 29 years from now?

Look, it is one of those presentations that is rather uncomfortable for most of us because the punch line is demographics, and that is not what we typically do here. But the reality is, we have a real issue. We are getting old very fast as a society.

Let's do a bit of a reminder here and actually look at the math. We are going to walk through a couple of these that are the same as last week, but the difference tonight is we are going to try to talk about a handful of solutions. There is a big package of solutions, and most of them are really hard and are really going to be cantankerous around here, but there are solutions to deal with.

Let's actually first walk through where we are at today. Once again, I won't worry about 1965 in the mix. It is important that anyone watching this, fellow Members of Congress, understand.

Today, 2021, 77 percent of all the spending that will come from Washington is mandatory. Only 10 percent is defense; 13 percent is functionally what we vote on. I think there is a huge misunderstanding in the public that we march off to Congress and are voting on these \$4 trillion budgets. We are not. We are functionally voting on this little green wedge here that is discretionary spending.

So if I came to you right now and said, okay, what is driving the debt

over the next 30 years? I am going to show you a number of slides that are going to show the budget is in balance except for two things—Social Security and Medicare. And it is mostly Medicare.

Social Security is actually quite fixable. There is a number of levers. None of the levers will make anyone particularly excited or happy, but we once calculated we had 24, 26 different levers to make Social Security solvent and keep our promises.

Remember, Social Security and Medicare are earned benefits. It is a societal contract. We have an obligation to be there.

But Medicare is a really tough one, and we need to actually go back to having the honest conversation about what drives much of this debt. Well, if you see here, this is taxes paid in, benefits out for Social Security. You notice they are pretty much in balance. Social Security is a fairly square deal. You get a little bit of a SPIF, on average, for the average American.

Where the numbers get really difficult is the average American couple is going to put in about \$161,000 into the part A Medicare, which is only the trust fund for just the hospital portion. The pharmaceuticals, the other doctor visits, the other things are general fund. So when you are paying your FICA tax, you are paying this here.

But that average couple is going to get \$522,000 in benefits. So the differential from \$161,000 to \$522,000 is the driver of the vast majority of U.S. sovereign debt over the next 30 years. It is this differential here. It is not that complicated.

One of the great frustrations here is my brothers and sisters on the left will come behind the microphone and say things like: Well, if we had Medicare for All, or we expanded the ACA, ObamaCare. That is not true. If anyone just takes a quick breath and steps back—and, look, Republicans are guilty on part of this, too. Those are financing bills. The ACA was financing it, who got subsidized and who has to pay. Medicare for All is just a change of who pays. None of that is about what we pay. And the Republican alternative was the same. It was about who got subsidized and who had to pay.

So what we are going to talk about are some of the revolutions in what we pay, changing the cost of healthcare. But we first need to understand the scale of these. Look, this is functionally the same size as we just had, but it is important to understand that for every dollar in, particularly on Medicare, we get \$3 in benefits back. And now you start to do that with the demographics of the country.

This is just a graphic. So you see the orange here. That is us just getting old. That is just simply us moving into our benefit years. The green is healthcare costs. We have known people were going to turn 65 for how many years in this country? And we are still avoiding the issue.

But you start to see, when you start to get into the 2050s, this here, your country has \$112 trillion of publicly borrowed debt, and 78 percent of that is just Medicare.

This is one of the slides that I actually see in my dreams because, if you understand math, if you are willing to own a calculator, this slide should scare you to death. The purple is functionally the borrowing of Social Security and the interest on it. This is the spending of Medicare and the interest on that.

You will notice in this board here \$112 trillion of borrowing, and it is mostly the cost of Medicare and the financing of that. The rest of the budget, if you remove Social Security and Medicare, is actually in balance.

Just a quick aside before the next board. How many times today behind these microphones did anyone come up and say that functionally the greatest threat to the stability of the country is the fact that we have waited so long? We are well into the baby boom moving into retirement, and you start to see the debt curve just explode on us.

So take a look at this board. Now, if you remove the pandemic years here and just functionally look at this 10-year cycle, why this is important—I know there are a lot of numbers and a lot of colors here. This board is basically saying one very simple thing. The vast majority, matter of fact, almost the entire debt for this decade and the decade after that and the decade after that, but for this decade is driven solely by Social Security and Medicare.

Think of that. In functionally 9 budget years, your country is scheduled to have functionally about \$2.2 trillion of borrowing, just borrowing every year, and almost all of that just came from Social Security and Medicare.

And look, dear Lord, please don't let interest rates move against us, but you start to actually see the Medicare outlays, the Medicare revenues, and then you get these arguments saying, well, if you would adjust defense. Well, defense is lying down here, and you start to realize—excuse me, the Medicare taxes and those are down here. You start to look at these gaps. This is where we are at.

Sorry, I was skipping ahead a board. If you were to eliminate the entire defense budget—so let's just wipe out the defense budget—you realize it buys you a year or two, but that is about it because this is the projected defense line, and this is Social Security and Medicare where we are going.

You would think, Members of Congress, if you actually cared about keeping our promises that we are going to protect Social Security, we are going to protect Medicare, how come every Member of Congress isn't walking behind this microphone holding up these boards and saying we are going to work on a solution to this? Instead, this is almost toxic around here.

I can't tell you how many Members I run into who say, DAVID, I want to talk

about the debt and deficits, too, and the fact that as we grab all the capital stock of the country, and maybe the world, that we are going to slow down the economy, that we are going to be poorer. Poor people will be poorer; rich people will be poorer. The country's productivity will be crushed. Oh, but I can't actually talk about the drivers of the debt.

I am going to actually say there are solutions. There is a way to actually start to take a step back and say, if we are willing to have an honest moment and say, okay, because the vast majority of Medicare is a general fund expenditure, what do we do? It is complicated. There are lots of parts of it.

But let's first understand. There is a rule about healthcare, and this is not only Medicare, Medicaid, VA, and Indian Health Services, but everything. Five percent of the population is over 50 percent of the spending. So if you love and care about people, but you also care about spending and healthcare costs, we need to understand the 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who drive most of our spending but also are the folks often living in absolute misery.

It turns out if you are willing to spend and invest to end people's misery, it ends up being a way you can actually also take on that debt and deficit.

Look, Republicans often come behind these microphones, and we have all sorts of ideas. My suggestion is we do all of them, but we need to be realistic.

Just as some of my Democratic colleagues will walk behind a microphone and say, well, if we had Medicare for All—back to the comment before, it is a financing bill. It doesn't actually change the cost of procedures. Unless they are willing to ratchet down and go into rationing, which they swear they won't, it is just an alternative way of paying for it.

Then we have Republicans who will come here and say, well, price transparency, I love price transparency. But the best peer-reviewed academic studies out there, it is only 0.1 to 0.7 percent improvement on price for healthcare costs.

Now, you still should do it, but if you really want to start thinking about things that drive healthcare costs, what would happen if I came to you and said—you saw in that previous board—what?—it was about \$78 trillion of borrowing, just borrowing is Medicare over the next 29, 30 years.

Thirty-one percent of Medicare is just diabetes. Thirty-one percent of Medicare cost is diabetes, and that is just Medicare. We haven't done the math for Medicaid, for Indian Health Services, for VA, for just the general populations.

□ 1900

But it helps you start to think about, okay, we know chronic conditions, 5 percent is over 50 percent of spending. We know in Medicare 31 percent is just

diabetes. Maybe we are starting to understand the drivers of what actually consumes our healthcare costs.

My proposal to anyone that is willing to hear is let's actually do something fairly radical—the concept of stepping up and legalizing technology in healthcare but also investing in disruption.

Right now, the left actually has some proposals that would functionally do some weird, quirky things such as, as soon as a drug comes off exclusivity, they are going to start to tax it, and hopefully that taxing actually starts now to move to create generics or force the one over here to become less expensive now because it is all functionally exclusivity off-patent, and I would like radically different thinking.

How about investing in absolutely curative disrupting research in drugs but also technology?

Let's actually walk through something that I find fascinating—and this board is a little hard because there is a lot of noise on it—but 16 percent of U.S. healthcare expenses is people not taking their drug appropriately. Think of that. That is like \$550 billion a year. So over half a trillion dollars a year is when someone doesn't take their hypertension medicine and then they have a stroke.

It turns out the fastest thing you can do tomorrow is the technology that actually helps people know that they should have taken their hypertension pill or their insulin at a certain time, the technology—because this is 16 percent of all healthcare.

If tomorrow you could remind grandma to take her medicines at the proper times during the day, someone with hypertension that they took their pills so they don't have a stroke, 16 percent of healthcare. And we have real simple technologies out there. We have the pill bottle cap that talks to you and reminds you that says, hey, you didn't open me today.

For someone that may have multiple pills at certain times of the day, you actually now have—and there are apparently all sorts of versions of this now—that drop the pill in the bottle and send you a text message, sends your grandkids a text message also to know that the pills are there.

The technology is here, and almost no one ever thinks about personal technology like this as a way to crash the price in healthcare. But it is 16 percent. It is \$550 billion in a single year, not 10 years, in a single year. So over half a trillion dollars a year you can strip out of healthcare costs if you could just get our brothers and sisters to take their pharmaceuticals in a way that keeps them healthy.

Now for some more radical proposals, so far this year, there are two papers out, one U.S.-based and actually one Taiwanese-based, but both from very prestigious universities. They appear to be peer-reviewed. We have been reading through them multiple times. We are trying to get other comments.

They talk about, hey, there may be a cure for type 1 diabetes. There may be a cure, still has a long way to go, but there actually appears to be some in-lab breakthroughs on type 2 diabetes.

Wouldn't you and I, the left, the right, stop some of the monkey business around here and say if we know 31 percent of Medicare cost—and we know Medicare is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt. It is time for an Operation Warp Speed for diabetes. You don't have to call it "Operation Warp Speed" because I know that triggers some folks on the left, but the fact of the matter is a concentration of bringing disruption to cure people to end misery because we have to stop this thought process here of saying the way we are going to end people's misery is we are going to build more clinics so you have more access to a doctor.

My argument is to have the revolution because the revolution is here. Just think, a couple of years ago, we were dealing with the cost of liver transplants for hepatitis C, and then we came up with a cure. We can do this.

Now you start to understand there are clinical trials out there for some new types of stem cell therapy. I read this paper multiple times because it was complicated and fascinating. Stem cell therapy, they worked through the rejection problem, and it appears—at least the early paper—to be a cure for type 1. There is a derivative paper that is out there actually from a Taiwanese university talking about their success in type 2.

It is a different thought process. One of the greatest things we can do for U.S. sovereign debt and not collapsing this society and destroying my 6-year-old daughter's economic future, as well as anyone that is heading toward retirement, is actually how we invest our money today in things that end people's misery, and by ending that misery, all of society as well as those individuals' benefit.

The amusing part is I have been on this floor for several years talking about messenger RNA. Back when we used to call it CAR-T and you heard the stories about taking someone who functionally their immune system, the cancer they had, doing functionally what we now know as mRNA. Well, it looks like the breakthroughs and the fact that we have now turned much of what are diseases into software problems, and this is hard for a lot of folks to think through, particularly in the time where we have those who are very virus and vaccine conscious, but there is incredible hope here.

As you all know, right now going into the field is functionally a vaccine

for malaria. Now, it is only about 30 percent, is the data, effective, but when teamed up with some other pharmaceutical, it is like 70 percent. It will change misery around the world.

Well, it turns out, that same messenger RNA goes far beyond COVID. We actually now are starting to understand malaria, a whole bunch of cancers. Do you know one of the published papers from early this summer looks like they think they actually have a cure for HIV? Influenza, heart disease, it is fascinating. But helping the body, actually its immune system, work and rehab the heart. There are some amazing things. You saw the papers earlier this year about cystic fibrosis and thinking we are almost there for a cure.

Remember, 5 percent is 50 percent of our healthcare spending. Maybe it is time to rethink about the world and the fact that we are going to invest in the disruption that is cures that end the misery instead of financing a country where we might actually lower drug costs, but the disruptions, the cures that could come in the future don't show up.

We can show you, in lots of studies, there are multiples out there when we are looking at the Democrats' H.R. 3 that by the end of the decade you actually saw the curve actually go up in healthcare costs because the cures didn't show up.

The other thing, and this is not a particularly great slide, and it is getting a little old, but we have a whole binder in the office of articles talking about algorithms and, in this case, AI being able now to detect cancers very early, and the fact of doing that with this type of technology and technology that you can have at home. You can actually almost have it wearable. You can have it in your own medicine cabinet. Using those types of technologies is also part of our path to crash the price of healthcare.

Remember, we are not going to change the United States getting older fast, the graying of America. But where we can bend the curve, bend misery and also bend the threat of the incredible amount of debt we are building up every single day, it is saying we are all in. We are going to do wearables. We are going to legalize technology. We are going to actually invest.

The fact of the matter is it is happening right now where we are actually seeing countries around the world realizing how big of a problem diabetes is. Now there are awards going out saying, wow, we actually now have lines of research that look like we can finally disrupt the disease.

So, this was sort of the follow-up on last week where we did the whole slide chart of what is actually happening in U.S. sovereign debt and how much trouble we are really in and how fast it is building.

You have to do a whole series of things. You have to grow the economy consistently. You have to manage tax policy. You have to manage regulatory policy in a way that is for maximizing economic expansion. You actually have to deal with immigration in a way that maximizes economic growth. Opening up your border, importing massive amounts of—let's be brutal about this—poverty where that poverty and inflation are crushing the working poor in this country. The working poor will be substantially poorer at the end of this decade because of these policies. That is cruel.

How about if we had growth? Because growth is moral. So you do these things of tax policy, regulatory policy, immigration policy, and then the financing and tax incentives and the encouragement to do things that disrupt because you could actually do it in both healthcare; you can do it in energy; you can do it in transportation where we can make the future actually pretty darn amazing and actually end a lot of suffering and turns out it is the path that actually bends that debt curve that wipes us out as a society if we don't actually start to tell the truth and deal with it.

There is a path. There is optimism. Every day this place squanders working on the real problems and instead of the insanity of some of the policies that are being proposed today that the economists on both sides say will make the country poorer by the end of the decade, we are going the wrong direction.

Madam Speaker, I hope at least someone out there hears the message that there is a path. It is just getting harder and harder to get there because every day we fall further in debt.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 4, 2021, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 3193, the E-BRIDGE Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 3193

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2022–2026	2022–2031
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	–1	–2	–3	6	0

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2570. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [Docket ID: DoD-2020-OS-0094] (RIN: 0790-AL17) received October 28, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2571. A letter from the Compliance Specialist, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tip Regulations Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA); Partial Withdrawal (RIN: 1235-AA21) received October 29, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-2572. A letter from the Yeoman Petty Officer First Class, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Key West Paddle Classic, Key West, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0757] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2573. A letter from the Legal Technician, CG-LRA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zones; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0760] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received November 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2574. A letter from the Legal Technician, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Columbia River Outfall Project, Columbia River, Vancouver, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0201] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2575. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays, Air Shows and Swim Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0135] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2576. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Chesapeake Bay, Between Sandy Point and Kent Island, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0505] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received November 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2577. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Educational Assistance for Certain Former Members of the Armed Forces (RIN: 2900-AQ74) received October 28, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2578. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterans Legacy Grants Program (RIN: 2900-AR00) received October 28, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2579. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification of Evidence for Proof of Service (RIN: 2900-AR13) received October 28, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3193. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for a high-speed broadband deployment initiative (Rept. 117-171 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4252. A bill to provide additional funding for scholarships for students at 1890 institutions; with an amendment (Rept. 117-172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3193 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 5830. A bill to establish an international terrestrial carbon sequestration program and provide international technical assistance for carbon market development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BANKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BALDERSON, and Ms. VAN DUYNE):

H.R. 5831. A bill to provide for the mandatory detention of aliens who are security risks or present insufficient or false credentials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5832. A bill to establish the Retirement Savings Lost and Found, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions related to horses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BACON, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HERN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H.R. 5834. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to replace the windfall elimination provision with a formula equalizing benefits for certain individuals with noncovered employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 5835. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to establish, implement, or enforce any vaccine mandate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5836. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for certain requirements with respect to media employment, ownership, and diversity reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5837. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services relating to substance use disorder treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 5838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 5839. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Charles R. Johnson for acts of valor during the Korean War while a member of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RESCENTIALER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BOST, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mr. FALLON):

H.R. 5840. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on the designation of the Muslim Brotherhood as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. GOLDEN):

H.R. 5841. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with elections to contributions or donations in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NADLER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. POSTER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5842. A bill to deter, prevent, reduce, and respond to harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of amounts related to employment discrimination and harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, House Administration, Oversight and Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 5843. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to consider certain transactions related to precious metals for purposes of identifying jurisdictions of primary money laundering concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 5844. A bill to provide for the modernization of electronic case management systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5845. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to regional standards for furnaces, central air conditioners, and heat pumps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANN (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 5846. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide grants to motor carriers and motor private carriers to transport goods during a national emergency or a period of time in which there is a certain percentage of port congestion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BALDERSON, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 5847. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that the transportation of goods from a port of entry and another place within the same State as such port does not constitute interstate transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 5848. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish within the Office of the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention the Office of Rural Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 5849. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5850. A bill to ensure an evidence-based funding approach to study the effects of health profession opportunity grant demonstration projects, and to evaluate the demonstration projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MAST, Mr. MANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 5851. A bill to void existing non-compete agreements for any employee who is fired for not complying with an employer's COVID-19 vaccine mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MAST, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 5852. A bill to extend the customs waters of the United States from 12 nautical miles to 24 nautical miles from the baselines of the United States, consistent with Presidential Proclamation 7219; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the dedication of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. OWENS, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H. Res. 766. A resolution recognizing law enforcement officers who have tragically passed away from the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MENG, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL, and Mr. MCEACHIN):

H. Res. 767. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that it is the duty of the Department of Defense to reduce the overall environmental impact of all military activities and missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GIBBS, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H. Res. 768. A resolution condemning the Biden administration for incentivizing illegal immigration by compensating illegal migrants who cross the southern border illegally and for stopping construction on the southern border wall and failing to enforce Migrant Protection Protocols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Ms. BOURDEAUX):

H. Res. 769. A resolution congratulating the Atlanta Braves for winning the 2021 Major League Baseball World Series and honoring the life of Henry Louis Aaron; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. JORDAN,

Mr. BOST, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MANN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. CLINE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida):

H. Res. 770. A resolution expressing support for the First Amendment to the Constitution and its bipartisan impact regarding the protection of free speech as well as academic freedoms for all students and faculty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H. Res. 771. A resolution congratulating Atlanta on winning the 2021 Major League Baseball World Series; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 5830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

In addition, clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution provides: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

In addition, clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, which provides: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 5831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 5834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 5835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 5838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 5839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 5840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 5842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 5846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Constitution, which states that the President "... shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 5847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 5848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 5849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 5852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 214: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MAST, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 217: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 364: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 516: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 783: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 851: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 1012: Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1179: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1193: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 1198: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1259: Mr. PALMER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1282: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1313: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1384: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1453: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1485: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 1630: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1667: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1733: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1745: Mr. MANN, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1782: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1926: Mrs. BOEBERT.

- H.R. 1927: Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 2035: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2099: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 2164: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2192: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 2202: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2249: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LIEU, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WILD, and Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 2294: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2351: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 2363: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2558: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2568: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 2589: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2601: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 2631: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2800: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2806: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2819: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2820: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2830: Mr. AMODEL.
H.R. 2834: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2907: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2920: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2986: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3271: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 3294: Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 3297: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3312: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3335: Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 3342: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3355: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 3488: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 3525: Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 3541: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3574: Mr. BARR, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3577: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BOST, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 3662: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3685: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3733: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3746: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3802: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3807: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 3847: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 3860: Mr. TAYLOR and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3932: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3940: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3952: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 3988: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 4108: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4151: Mr. CASE, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. BOURDEAUX.
H.R. 4233: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4287: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 4366: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4407: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4429: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4433: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 4565: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4603: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 4625: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4677: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4694: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4702: Mr. MOORE of Alabama and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4716: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 4764: Mr. MOONEY.
H.R. 4766: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4785: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 4821: Mr. ELLZEY.
H.R. 4865: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and Mr. WILIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 4878: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4923: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 5008: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5029: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5141: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5151: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5155: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5170: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 5314: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. MANING.
H.R. 5333: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 5459: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 5471: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 5477: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 5482: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 5487: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5529: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5537: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5538: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5539: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5540: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5543: Ms. CHU, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 5577: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CASE, Mr. CROW, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 5581: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5590: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 5600: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 5608: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5629: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5632: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 5652: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 5653: Mr. DONALDS and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 5694: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FALLON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 5710: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 5727: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 5735: Mr. KIND, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. STEIL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 5742: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5743: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 5744: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 5754: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 5755: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 5759: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 5762: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 5768: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 5772: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 5788: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 5793: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 5801: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 5811: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 5812: Mr. GOOD of Virginia and Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 5828: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WILD, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. GOHMERT.
H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. NORMAN.
H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. WAGNER, and Ms. CHENEY.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H. Res. 259: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H. Res. 314: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 389: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H. Res. 436: Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 529: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 550: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Res. 684: Mr. HILL.
H. Res. 703: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Res. 712: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 731: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. FERGUSON.
H. Res. 733: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 760: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.